The Thesis Committee for John Alexander Gleb
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

Nightmares and Awakenings: The *Stultitia* Affair, Corporate Nationalism, and the Politics of Professional Diplomacy in the United States, 1906–1913

APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Jeremi Suri, Supervisor

Mark Lawrence

Nightmares and Awakenings: The *Stultitia* Affair, Corporate Nationalism, and the Politics of Professional Diplomacy in the United States, 1906–1913

by

John Alexander Gleb

Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2020

Abstract

Nightmares and Awakenings: The *Stultitia* Affair, Corporate Nationalism, and the Politics of Professional Diplomacy in the United States, 1906–1913

John Alexander Gleb, MA

The University of Texas at Austin, 2020

Supervisor: Jeremi Suri

At the beginning of the twentieth century, reformers working within the State Department and the American foreign service attempted to place their country's foreign policymaking machinery under the control of trained professionals. However, the structure of the United States' democratic political institutions and the existence of a powerful court of public opinion beyond their walls restricted the professionals' freedom of action. This paper will explore how one of the leaders of the foreign service reform movement, Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson, attempted to reconcile professional diplomacy and American democracy. Between 1906 and 1913, Wilson developed and pursued what I will call a "corporate nationalist" agenda, seeking to create a unified national community within which elite policymakers, ordinary citizens, and their elected representatives would work together in perfect, symbiotic harmony. An extended contextual analysis of *Stultitia*, a semiautobiographical play Wilson wrote in 1913, will

guide my argument and open up a window onto the "thought-world" of one the United States' first professional foreign policymakers.

Table of Contents

PART ONE. THE THOUGHT-WORLD OF HUNTINGTON WILSON

1.1. Introduction

On New Year's Day, 1915, an unusual political scandal engulfed Washington, D. C. At its heart was a play—*Stultitia: A Nightmare and an Awakening in Four Discussions*—which satirized Congressional stewardship of American foreign and defense policy. Unsigned, privately printed, and distributed "mysteriously" to members of the political and military elite, *Stultitia* quickly attracted widespread comment. Two local papers printed extended analyses of the play, reporting breathlessly that "[a]lmost everyone in official circles" was talking about it; rumor had it that "Congressmen, Cabinet officers, [and] the President himself" had received copies.[1] News of the "sensation" in the capital was soon surging through the national press, too, breaking in New York, Chicago, and St. Louis within twenty-four hours.[2] With notoriety came public interest and, briefly, fame. Alan Dale, an influential dramatic critic, reviewed *Stultitia*; the great Broadway producer Harry von Tilzer offered to stage it; and notices and appraisals appeared in such improbably remote places as Clarksburg, West Virginia, Oshkosh, Wisconsin, and even the small Canadian city of Saint John, New Brunswick.[3]

---

[1] "'U. S. Has Chip on Shoulder, Arms in Sling,'" Washington *Herald*, 2 January 1915; "Capital Seeks to Identify Author of Satire on Nation's Political and Civic Leaders," Washington *Times*, 2 January 1915;"'Who Is He?' Asks All Washington," Boston *Sunday Post*, 24 January 1915—all in Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson Papers, Myrin Library, Ursinus College, Collegeville, PA [henceforth: *HWP*].

[2] "Diplomat's Play Mocks at Uncle Sam's Peace Plans," New York *Sun*, 2 January 1915, *HWP*; "Play Scoffs at U. S. Defense," Chicago *Daily Tribune*, 2 January 1915, *HWP*; "U. S. Navy, Unready, Defeated in Play," St. Louis *Republic*, 2 January 1915, *HWP*.

[3] "Alan Dale Says," San Francisco *Chronicle*, 17 January 1915, *HWP*; "Several Suspected as Author of Play," Washington *Times*, 6 January 1915, *HWP*; "Unpreparedness," Clarksburg *Telegram*, 17 January 1915, *HWP*; "Donald Brian May Retire from Stage," Saint John *Times-Star*, 23 January 1915, *HWP*; Review of *Stultitia* in Oshkosh *Northwestern*, 22 May 1915, *HWP*.

Despite the publicity campaign, the play was never performed and eventually faded from the headlines. But for a few months, it captured the public's attention, thanks largely to the savagery of its attacks on American political institutions. "Never," wrote one awe-struck reporter, "has a more caustic, biting treatment been given to Washington officials and their official lives."[4]

What was the object of this "caustic, biting treatment"? Why had *Stultitia* been written? Many reviewers associated the play with the "preparedness" movement, classing it with other works of literature devoted to highlighting the American military establishment's supposedly poor state of readiness for armed conflict.[5] But other, more nuanced interpretations surfaced as well. One of the most important focused attention on the links the author seemed to have drawn between the preparedness issue, political dysfunction, and a number broader socio-political phenomena: mass immigration, the declining vitality of the "old American stock," greed, and the proliferation of "peace fiends and faddists." All were denounced in a despairing climactic soliloquy delivered by one of *Stultitia*'s protagonists, Captain Hawk of the United States Army, which several newspapers chose to reprint as indicative of "the spirit of the play": "What do I see? A mob divided by a thousand selfish interests. A nation of ninety millions? Bah! . . . [But t]he correct thing is to say, 'All's well'; to say 'we can lick creation,'—to say it again

[4] "Capital Seeks to Identify Author."
[5] See, for example, "War and America," New York *Times*, 24 January 1915; "Our Present Military Situation," Newark *Evening News*, 1 May 1915—both in *HWP*.

until we believe it and to go blindly on.'"[6] The purpose of dialogue like this seemed clear enough to the Boston *Evening Transcript*. The author of *Stultitia*, the *Transcript* concluded, "obviously has a mission and that is to show the danger of the international position of the United States in diplomacy and in unpreparedness for war, and to show who is responsible. He blames politics and the faddists for the situation."[7]

The world of *Stultitia* was indeed filled with "faddists" and incompetents. However, the play also hinted at a way to mitigate their impact on the policymaking process. That "remedy," suggested the *Evening Transcript*, was to ensure "that Congress prepare the country for defence [*sic*] regardless of politics or fads, *and that diplomats be appointed because they know what to do rather than because of what they have done for the party*."[8] Here was a second subtextual agenda: an argument in favor of professionalizing the management of American foreign relations. As the Washington *Evening Star* pointed out, the play's heroes were all "expert officials and students of international affairs at the departments of State, War, and Navy"; its plot pivoted about the tragic, losing battle they had to fight against a "rabble" of hack politicians, meddling lobbyists, and foreign agents.[9] Pressing this interpretation further, the Boston *Sunday Post* speculated that *Stultitia*'s author was himself a professional civil servant who, "feeling . . . heckled beyond further endurance by Congress and by the amateurs who

---

[6] "U. S. Has Chip on Shoulder"; "Diplomat's Play." For the original text, see [Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson,] *Stultitia: A Nightmare and an Awakening in Four Discussions* (New York: Vail-Ballou, 1914), 156–62.
[7] "The Folly of Unpreparedness," Boston *Evening Transcript*, 3 February 1915, *HWP*.
[8] "The Folly of Unpreparedness."
[9] Review of *Stultitia* in Washington *Evening Star*, 16 January 1915, *HWP*.

constantly interfere with the intelligent carrying forth of the affairs of the nation, ha[d] poured forth his pent-up soul."[10] As if to confirm the *Post*'s theory, the play's publishers printed a promotional booklet which described *Stultitia* in the following terms:

> Patriotic department chiefs who have studied and know the country's need are blocked in their efforts at adequate preparation by those senators and congressmen who, knowing nothing of the actual conditions, care only for their own political fortunes. The vividness of the scenes in which these facts are brought out leave no doubt that the author has personally been through some of the heart-breaking incidents he describes.[11]

He had indeed. For the author in question was none other than Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson, a former Assistant Secretary of State. Between 1906 and 1913, Wilson had spearheaded an effort to bring American diplomacy under the control of a rationalized, bureaucratized foreign service administered by trained professionals. But the extreme difficulty of carrying out this project in the United States, a democratic republic in which the political tides rarely seemed to favor foreign service reform or professional diplomacy, had driven him out of the State Department in frustration. It had also convinced him to write *Stultitia*.

Yet Wilson's play was no mere scream into the void; it sought to do more than stroke the egos of a few long-suffering reformers. As a reviewer writing for the Los Angeles *Times* sensed, *Stultitia* had been written for a larger audience of "Americans":

> Not merely for the two-legged be-skirted and be-trousered individuals who enjoy civic rights within the country's boundaries; but for those with American hearts—for those whose love of country is not limited to a gluttonous enjoyment of the food the country produces, [or] a mercenary affection for the money they dig out of the ground.

---

[10] "'Who Is He?' Asks All Washington."

[11] Promotional booklet for *Stultitia* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes, 1915), *HWP*.

Simultaneously endorsing and reproducing some of the play's key themes, the *Times* cheered Captain Hawk's soliloquy, which "graphically expresse[d] what sensible people have a right to believe are the basic disorders of government." The only problem was that "sensible people" existed in relatively small numbers:

> There are too many fools in the nation for [*Stultitia*] to be widely popular; too many [quoting Hawk] "faddists who think in segments when national questions are at issue"; too many parvenu politicians nursing the admiration of befogged constituents when they should be serving the nation instead of their own chances of re-election. Yes, and perhaps too many potentially good citizens who feed their brains on cream-puffs and stubbornly refuse to think.[12]

What the *Times* failed to grasp, however, was that the "fools"—especially the "potentially good citizens . . . stubbornly refus[ing] to think"—constituted an integral part of Wilson's intended audience, too. As this paper will demonstrate, *Stultitia* was designed to help its author realize what I will call a "corporate nationalist" agenda. Its primary objective was to reforge the fractured "mob" of Americans into a unified, coherent national community free of the debilitating social diseases singled out by Captain Hawk. Only then, Wilson had come to believe, would it be possible to reconcile professional diplomacy with American domestic politics; only then would the war against the "rabble" cease. Foreign service reform and national reconstruction therefore had to proceed in lock-step.

Using the *Stultitia* Affair as a point of entry, I will analyze the evolution of corporate nationalism within the State Department at the beginning of the twentieth

[12] "A National Satire," Los Angeles *Times*, 18 April 1915, *HWP*.

century. The private papers of Huntington Wilson, supplemented by official State Department documents, Congressional records, and press coverage of the foreign service reform movement, will guide my argument. Analyzing them will open up a window onto the "thought-world" of one the United States' first professional foreign policymakers—and, in doing so, reveal the contours of the "cognitive map" which guided his efforts to rebuild the American diplomatic establishment.[13]

1.2. Huntington Wilson's Cognitive Map and the Origins of Corporate Nationalism

Spatial maps organize information with reference to four cardinal directions: North, South, East, and West. Likewise, Huntington Wilson's cognitive map encompassed four cardinal intellectual impulses. Scholars have identified and analyzed three of these in some detail already. The primary goal of this paper will be to shed light on the fourth impulse—the corporate nationalist impulse—which will be defined at greater length at the end of this chapter. However, in order to understand the significance of Wilson's corporate nationalism, it is first necessary to describe its three counterparts and assess their impact on the development of the American foreign service.

1.2.1. The Organizational Impulse

The first of these, influenced by the tenets of the so-called "efficiency gospel," was an "organizational" impulse which fetishized bureaucracy, businesslike managerial

[13] For this concept, see T. G. Otte, "Eyre Crowe and British Foreign Policy: A Cognitive Map," in T. G. Otte and Constantine Pagedas, eds., *Personalities, War, and Diplomacy: Essays in International History* (London: Routledge, 1997), 14–37.

practices, and the architecture of the administrative state. Jerry Israel has identified Wilson as one of the efficiency gospel's most influential prophets within the Progressive Era foreign service, placing him at the head of an attempt to transform the State Department and agents under its command into components of a "diplomatic machine" run according to the principals of scientific management. At back of this project stood a "social Taylorist" hypothesis which posited that disorderly societies would inevitably succumb, via a kind of evolutionary pressure, to better organized, more efficient rivals.[14] Wilson applied the logic of social Taylorism and social evolution to the organization of the foreign service. His conclusion was simple: "A hermit nation needs no diplomacy, but once a nation abandons isolation, the efficiency of its diplomacy is a matter of serious concern to every citizen."[15]

Wilson's interest in fine-tuning the American "diplomatic machine" also encouraged him to help free it from the so-called "Spoils System," the practice of hiring and firing civil servants according to the partisan pressure and the exigencies of political patronage. During the nineteenth century, the Spoils System had reigned supreme over the foreign service: whenever one political party fell from power and another rose in its place, the victors tended to treat consular and diplomatic jobs as "spoils of office," ousting veteran incumbents to make way for inexperienced friends and allies. Wilson had actually benefitted from this process when he joined the diplomatic service in 1897,

---

[14] Jerry Israel, "A Diplomatic Machine: Scientific Management in the Department of State, 1906–1924," in Jerry Israel, ed., *Building the Organizational Society: Essays on Associational Activities in Modern America* (New York: Free Press, 1972).
[15] [Francis Mairs] Huntington Wilson, "The American Foreign Service," *Outlook* 82/9 (1906), 499.

netting himself a secretarial position at the American legation in Tokyo by exploiting his connections to powerful Republican officials. But his encounter with the Spoils System State Department, though successful, was far from pleasant. "There were no examinations; no attempt to determine qualifications," he recalled later in life. "I was thrown into diplomacy, indeed thrown into life, without due preparation or advice, just as I had earlier been thrown into the water to learn to swim."[16] The ordeal seems to have left a lasting impression on Wilson's mind, triggering his organizational impulse. "[I]nefficiency due to lack of qualifications, to inadequate professional education, and to want of experience"—"These," he declared in 1905, "are the vices of our unsystematized service." Therefore, "the extinction of the '[S]poils [S]ystem'" was a "reform of the first necessity."[17]

This call for change was remarkably well-timed. Foreign service officers and their political allies had been agitating against the Spoils System for decades, and between 1905 and 1909, their efforts bore fruit. Although a complete analysis of the ways in which the foreign service transformed during this period lies beyond the scope of this paper, two innovations bear mentioning: the State Department revived a long-dormant entrance exam for the consular service and established a new exam for screening secretaries of legation. Scholars disagree about the efficacy of these early strides towards meritocracy, but their implementation provided Wilson, who became Third Assistant Secretary of State in July 1906 and then First Assistant Secretary in March 1909, with an

[16] *ibid*., *Memoirs of an Ex-Diplomat* (Boston: Bruce Humphries, 1945), 46–47.
[17] *ibid*., "American Foreign Service," 501.

opportunity to strike a blow against some of the inefficient "vices" he found so irritating. In his new administrative role, Wilson was able to play a major role in calibrating the two foreign service exams. "I worked on the [examination] board's regulations that first summer," Wilson later explained, "for a foreign service based on qualifications and efficiency was one of the things I had most at heart."[18]

1.2.2. THE MELIORIST IMPULSE

Wilson's desire to fill the foreign service with experienced, well-qualified officers did not spring solely from his obsession with organization, however. In addition to the efficiency gospel, the Third Assistant Secretary also embraced what Robert Schulzinger has called "the [P]rogressive faith in the meliorative impact of acquired knowledge." As Schulzinger has shown, the scholars and practitioners responsible for shaping the American "diplomatic mind" at the beginning of the twentieth century encouraged diplomats to think of themselves as disinterested stewards of their respective national communities on the world stage, qualified to fill this role by their field experience and "realistic" outlook.[19] Over the course of his career at the State Department, Wilson drank deep from the Progressive meliorist punchbowl and absorbed its main ingredients.

---

[18]On the long campaign against the "Spoils System" and the transformation of the service, see *The Master Architects: Building the United States Foreign Service, 1890–1913* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1977), 1–171; and Warren Frederick Ilchman, *Professional Diplomacy in the United States, 1779–1939: A Study in Administrative History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 41–118. Werking's evaluation of the reforms is notably more positive than Ilchman's. On Wilson's involvement in the design of the foreign service exams, see Wilson, *Memoirs*, 155–56 [for the quote]; Ilchman, *Professional Diplomacy*, 97;.

[19] Robert Schulzinger, *The Making of the Diplomatic Mind: The Training, Outlook, and Style of American Foreign Service Officers, 1908–1931* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1975), esp. 35 [for the quote], 52–53.

"Governments," he told an audience attending the Third National Peace Congress in 1911, were "the trustees of the nations' international interests . . . beset at every turn by considerations of what is practicable, what is practical, what is not and will in future be for the true and enduring benefit of the nations they serve." It was thus only logical that "the everyday work of peace through a benevolent and candid diplomacy . . . must fall upon governments and upon departments of government expert in the facts of international relations."[20]

In order to ensure that the State Department would indeed be "expert in the facts of international relations," Wilson proposed a series of administrative reforms designed to create and empower cadres of knowledgeable veteran officials. The most ambitious called for the creation of a "Political Committee" in order to "consolidate and concentrate the consideration of all matters affecting policy." The Secretary of State would serve as the committee's president, but its other members would all be senior administrative officials: namely, Assistant Secretaries like Wilson as well as "the chiefs of any bureaux [*sic*.], offices or subdivisions which may be concerned with the matter under consideration." Those "bureaux, offices, and subdivisions" were themselves to be reorganized along "politico-geographic" lines, each of which would be responsible for coordinating policy towards a particular world region. The "immeasurable advantage" of such a system, argued Wilson, was that it would assign to "a certain group of men" within each division "the duty of making a study of and being an authority upon a certain

[20] "Address of the Hon. Huntington Wilson, Assistant Secretary of State, at the Third National Peace Conference," Baltimore, 4 May 1911, *HWP*.

group of countries." Rotating officers between field postings and the State Department would help facilitate this process, "[giving] the Department the benefit of knowledge of actual conditions in foreign countries recently acquired on the spot"; it would also give Departmental personnel a chance to apply insights gained at home and simultaneously "broaden their experience" by living abroad. The result, predicted Wilson, would be a more politically active, technically proficient, and intelligent foreign service: [T]his method of interchange . . . greatly increases the number of men who are expected to assume responsibility, to possess special information, and to do intellectual work."[21]

1.2.3. THE ARISTOCRATIC IMPULSE

Taken together, the organizational and meliorist impulses described above map neatly onto the "forward-looking" strain of reformist thought Waldo Heinrichs has identified within the turn-of-the-century diplomatic service. "[R]esponding to the dominant impulses of the [P]rogressive movement," this strain "[emphasized] the rational organization and special skills of the modern bureaucratic society." However, it also comingled with a "backward"-looking quasi-aristocratic counterpart, which "stress[ed] individual qualities and elite rule." Heinrichs was not referring specifically to Wilson when he wrote these words. But as Richard Jay Eppinga has pointed out, the Third Assistant Secretary "combined both of Heinrichs' "strains" in one person: although he "believed deeply in the value of common-sense practicality, scientific realism, and

[21] Duplicate of departmental reorganization plan, "Sept[ember] 1906?" (handwritten in margin), Folder 3, Doc. 3, *HWP*. For the full history of Wilson's Departmental reorganization scheme, see Werking, *Master Architects*, 121–71; and Ilchman, *Professional Diplomacy*, 98–101.

bureaucratic efficiency," Wilson was also "imbued with the concept of *noblesse oblige*," having been born into "an upper-class elite of education and wealth."[22]

Without question, Wilson's silver-spoon background and Yale education positioned him near the top of the American social hierarchy. It is therefore unsurprising that his public statements and plans for reform occasionally evince the kind of genteel personalism Heinrichs described. "A Russian foreign minister emphasized the indubitable importance of this personal element," Wilson informed the readers of the *Outlook* in 1905. "[H]e is recorded as saying that his decision [to admit or reject candidates applying to enter his country's diplomatic service] was based rather upon the impression each candidate personally made on him . . . than upon the relative merits of their examination papers." Wilson fully endorsed this method of selection and the premises on which it rested. "[I]n diplomacy," he argued, "a number of very intangible qualities are wanted." In addition to "quick perception" and "an analytical mind," the hallmarks of good breeding—"[t]act, address, . . . balance, and self-control"—figured among the "natural qualities" the ideal Wilsonian diplomat was supposed to have.[23] And in order to detect them, Wilson insisted that the new foreign service entrance exams include an oral interview component, accounting for one-half of each candidate's total score. This

---

[22] Waldo H. Heinrichs, Jr., "Bureaucracy and Professionalism in the Development of American Career Diplomacy," in John Braeman, Robert H. Bremner, and David Brody, eds., *Twentieth-Century American Foreign Policy*, 137–54 [quote on 144–45]; Richard Jay Eppinga, "Aristocrat, Nationalist, Diplomat: The Life and Career of Huntington Wilson," (PhD dissertation, Michigan State University,1972), 59–60.
[23] Wilson, "American Foreign Service," 501.

innovation, he would later claim, was "perhaps . . . my most important contribution" to the design of the exam system.[24]

1.2.4. Democracy and the Origins of the Corporate Nationalist Impulse

It should be clear by now that the three impulses described above—and the reforms they generated—were all in one way or another fundamentally anti-democratic in character: they sought to bureaucratize the American diplomatic establishment and place it under the control of a specially-trained, socially homogeneous elite held apart from the rest of American society. But they did not do so unchecked. In fact, reformers like Wilson recognized that they would never be able to insulate themselves completely from democratic politics. The structure of the federal government and the existence of a powerful court of public opinion beyond its walls restricted the foreign service's freedom of action, especially as far as the conclusion of international agreements was concerned. Wilson's colleague Lewis Einstein, an eloquent champion of professional foreign policymaking, cut straight to the heart of the issue in 1909:

> Our foreign policy is destined by the very basis of American national existence to be developed amid conditions differing from those prevalent elsewhere. In European states it lies within the power of the executive to frame alliances without having recourse to parliamentary approval . . . . With us the Senate's necessary ratification, and the consequent publicity in the case of all agreements of a binding nature, entail a radically different procedure.[25]

Wilson, too, recognized that political authority did not belong exclusively to bureaucrats. "[I]n a democracy," he wrote in 1917, "the degree to which wise leadership dare outrun

---

[24] *ibid*., *Memoirs*, 155–56; *ibid*., "American Foreign Service," 501; Ilchman, *Professional Diplomacy*, 97.
[25] [Lewis Einstein], *American Foreign Policy* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1909), 175–76. On Einstein, see Schulzinger, *Diplomatic Mind*, 29–35.

the positive and active conviction of the mass of voters is, in a good cause, almost always too small for the country's good." Thus, any foreign policy decision—even a correct one—could only stand if it received support from the public.[26]

What held people and their leaders together, Wilson believed, was loyalty—disciplined, self-abnegating loyalty to the nation as a unit, to its interests and traditions, and to the state which had emerged from them. A society organized along such lines already seemed to exist in Japan, where Wilson had served as an embassy secretary before his transfer to the State Department. Among the "conspicuous virtues" of Japanese citizens were "self-control," "deadly earnestness," and "indomitable courage" in battle. Equally impressive, though, was their "family solidarity and mutual responsibility," not just to relatives but to the state. "Vis à vis the rest of the world," he explained to an American audience in 1906, "the Japanese nation is one great family with the nation's head its father. The individual respects the interests of the state as well as those of his family before his own." It was a model fit for export: "I wish American children and American men had a little more of this spirit."[27]

Sure enough, images of reciprocal obligation to state and society saturate Wilson's speeches and articles on American professional diplomacy. Taken together, they trace the contours of an ideal United States, a corporate national community in which elite policymakers, ordinary citizens, and their elected representatives work

[26] Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson, "A Permanent Alliance of the English-Speaking Peoples," *Bulletin* of the American Rights League 38 (December 1917), *HWP*.
[27] *ibid*., speech to Yale alumni, "1906" [handwritten note in margin], *HWP*.

together in perfect, symbiotic harmony. At its head stood a President who, on the world stage, was "the deputy of the whole nation, and act[ed] in response to its needs and will."[28] The Secretary of State likewise "[spoke] for the whole country to the whole world"; his actions were bound by "what may perhaps be called the peculiar constitution of the Department of State, that is, the fixed foreign policy of the country, which has gradually been built up by many wise presidents and able secretaries."[29] A sense of "pride in the Department's work and an absolute loyalty to it and a hearty cooperation"—"I mean," Wilson elaborated, that "everybody should put the Department as a whole above his own particular Division or office"—would become the foreign service's "*esprit de corps*." At the same time, the "evolution of democratic government" obliged diplomats to engage in "the furtherance of . . . political and commercial interests . . . based on the safety, the aspirations, and the ideals of each nation as a whole."[30] In the name of policy continuity and service to the "whole" nation, the foreign service had to be held "above the tides and eddies of partisanship": "Political parties come and go, but the Nation abides." Even so, Congressmen and their constituents also owed the foreign service loyalty and unity, since diplomacy was a task in which "America must be one. It is clear," declared Wilson, "that the status of a government in its relation to other

---

[28] Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson, speech to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, undated but "possibly 1912," *HWP*.
[29] *ibid*., "The Department of State," installment of *The Story of a Great Nation* series, *National*, July 1909, *HWP*.
[30] "Notes of a Meeting Held in the Diplomatic Reception Room of the Department of State on Monday, March 20, 1911," *HWP*. Online version: https://digitalcommons.ursinus.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=fmhw_speeches; [Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson,] "Improving the American Diplomat," *Harper's Weekly*, 24 August 1912.

governments is increased in direct ratio with its homogeneity of aim and effort. A government of divided councils, if weak at home, is as weak, or still weaker, abroad."[31]

This last statement highlights the danger inherent in Wilson's corporate nationalist worldview. For if the power of the state emerged from its union with a homogenized citizenry, any sign of distraction or discord seemed potentially catastrophic. At his worst, Wilson railed wildly against what he referred to as the "perils of peace and wealth": laziness and indifference to anything "for the country, and not for our very selves"; deference to ignorant politicians and journalists, such that "[t]he harmony we should hear in the working of our institutions is drowned out by these"; the "mad individualism" of consumer culture and the working classes; apathy among the ranks of the nation's "best men" and "finest minds," who were "giving themselves all to themselves" and so "giving nothing to the country"; and, worst of all, "[t]hose hordes of immigrants who have come here only to make money." Such things could doom the United States to suffer a dissolute Roman death at the hands of its enemies abroad. "We don'[t] know where we are going; nor care enough," Wilson fretted. "We shall grow to be a sodden, hybrid, glutton [*sic*.], wallowing in wealth and luxury, lousy with every kind of crank and agitator, too lazy to raise bleared eyes to the high life of mind and spirit and true patriotism, sinking ever deeper until some higher civilization blots us from the cumbered earth."[32]

---

[31] *ibid*., speech to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, *HWP*.
[32] [*ibid*.], "Save America!," unpublished political pamphlet, "15 May 1915" [handwritten note in margin], *HWP*.

Corporate nationalist awakening or social evolutionary nightmare; Union or Death—according to Wilson, this was the stark choice Americans faced at the beginning of the twentieth century. The stronger the bonds they developed with the new foreign service grew, the safer they would become. Movement in the opposite direction, however, would portend disaster.

1.3. Corporate Nationalism and the Foreign Service

Initially, Huntington Wilson expressed a great deal of confidence in the capacity of his fellow citizens to understand and support the cause of professional diplomacy. "There is evident," he wrote in 1905, "a growing sentiment among Americans in favor of reorganizing and improving the foreign service . . . and placing it upon a stable basis. Indeed, this feeling has become so general and so strong that but for our extreme conservatism something would have been done in that direction before the present time."[33] Three and a half years later, on the eve of his appointment to the First Assistant Secretaryship of State, Wilson no longer believed that public feeling had outstripped the pace of reform. Even so, prospects for the future seemed promising. Gone were the days, he informed the readers of the *National* magazine in January 1909, when "the intense internal development of the United States so completely absorbed public thought that foreign relations, and with them the Department of State, fell rather far into . . . oblivion." Now, the United States had been forced "by the weight of its own greatness . . . into a prominent place in the field of diplomacy"; it was therefore "much to be hoped that the

[33] *ibid*., "American Foreign Service," 499.

Department of State will increasingly receive that support and that intelligent public interest in its work and in the work of the foreign service under its command, which were for a long period so sadly lacking."[34]

But at precisely the moment when the public seemed ready to rally behind the state, the state was in peril of emasculating itself via a peculiar kind of bureaucratic overcivilization. This, at least, is what many foreign service reformers feared. "There are two ways," Wilson wrote in 1905, "of having an inefficient foreign service. One is the spoils system, under which we have suffered for so long." The second, however, was a hypothetical, "absolutely iron-clad civil service system wherein a man, once appointed a young secretary, would have nothing to do but grow old to be automatically promoted." A foreign service operated under such a system might succumb to the "vice" of "apathy and indifference"; "closed" bureaucracy, Wilson argued, "encourages apathy and laziness and brings men to the grade of ambassador or minister with their energies stifled by a life of ease, with no competition to spur them to wide-awake thinking and energetic action."[35]

The image of flaccid, somnolent foreign service officers was bad enough. But their loss of vitality also threatened to detach them from the corporate national community. "A charge which may be brought against an organized foreign service," Wilson acknowledged, was that its officers "sometimes lose touch with the ideas of their own country. They are too long away from home."[36] One of Wilson's predecessors,

---

[34] *ibid*., "Department of State."
[35] Wilson, "American Foreign Service"; *ibid*., "Improving the American Diplomat," *Harper's Weekly*, 24 August 1912, *HWP*.
[36] *ibid*., "American Foreign Service."

Francis B. Loomis, described the progression of their ailment: "My own observation, . . . one I share with a great many men who have been employed in the Foreign Service of the United States, is that most consuls who have lived abroad for a long period unconsciously drift away from the distinctive sentiment, thoughts, and purposes of the United States"; they "gain polish and culture, but lose all ambition, save the ambition to live abroad." From this emerged a tendency to befriend and flatter the locals, to "habitually and servilely defer" to their interests, and even to criticize the United States in doing so. "When a Consular or Diplomatic Officer reaches this condition of development or degeneracy," Loomis believed, "his usefulness as a public functionary ceases. He is no longer a true and efficient representative of his country." Loomis' conclusion had an obvious corporate nationalist corollary: "We must be represented abroad by Americans, by men who have a vital interest in their country, by men who have a firm, inherent, but modest pride in it, and who will uphold its good qualities."[37]

"Upholding the good qualities" of the United States was a task easier said than done, though. "It has sometimes been stated that Americans will do in Paris what they would not do in their own homes," joked Secretary of State Elihu Root during an interview with the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. In "the Orient," too, "people of western nations" often behaved according to "different standards of morality . . . than those they conform to at home. It is a very severe test of a man to send him east or to a place in the Tropics," Root contended, "and a great many men who keep perfectly

[37] Loomis, "Foreign Service of the United States," 352.

straight at home, under all the restraints of home life, go to pieces there." The point was deadly serious—and baldly xenophobic: exposure to foreign cultures might corrupt American officials, leaving them "dissipated, . . . drunken, . . . idle and inefficient."[38] And vices like these could easily metastasize into the more openly anti-American pathology Loomis had described. Root reported a particularly egregious case to the Foreign Affairs Committee. An American consul stationed in an unnamed European country "had purchased a commission for his son in the army of that country, and had established himself there, and had broken off all connection with this country to such a degree that I would have felt justified in refusing him a passport . . . ; and yet," Root pointed out with palpable disgust, "he was acting as our consul." Of course, he was acting in name only. The consulate under his command was "just as much the business office of the citizens of [the] country [in which it was located], and as devoid of any feature of Americanism as could be found anywhere."[39]

Expatriation thus posed a serious challenge to committed corporate nationalists like Wilson—and as a result, it received a serious response. As they set about rebuilding the American diplomatic establishment, the Third Assistant Secretary and his colleagues carefully readjusted their reform schemes in order to give the new foreign service a manlier, more "American" complexion.

---

[38] "Hearing on the Bill (S. 1345) to Provide for the Reorganization of the Consular Service of the United States," House Committee on Foreign Affairs, 16 February 1906, *ProQuest Congressional* [henceforth: *PC*], 10.
[39] *ibid.*

One of the most obvious vehicles for achieving this goal was the so-called "Americanization" campaign, which sought to purge the consular service of all non-citizens.[40] "Seventy per cent of all our subordinate consular offices abroad are now filled by foreigners," the reformist consul James T. DuBois complained in 1902. "One hundred and fifty foreigners fill the important positions of United States vice-consuls," and worse still, "there are foreigners occupying a few of our principal offices." To DuBois, the problems with this arrangement seemed obvious: foreign officers were not trustworthy stewards of American commerce. "[N]ot 5 per cent of them," he claimed, "have the least interest in the American foreign trade" or "any idea of our policies, foreign or domestic, and many of them are enemies of our policy of American commercial expansion."[41] Secretary of State Elihu Root agreed. "[H]owever loyal they might be to their employer," he argued, the "opinions and sympathies and prejudices" of foreign clerks "are naturally with their own country rather than America." Americanization was therefore desirable "not on any spread-eagle or sentimental ground, but upon practical business considerations." It was, after all, the job of the consular service to promote American trade with real interest and zeal, "accompanied by an understanding of American ways of thinking and acting. I do not think we can have this without having the personnel of our consulates substantially American."[42] DuBois and his allies agreed. "Thoroughly

---

[40] The "Americanization" of consular personnel is discussed briefly in Werking, *Master Architects,* 113–16.

[41] "Statement of Hon. James T. DuBois Before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, February 20, 1902," Appendix B of report on H. R. 84, "Reorganization of the Consular Service," 2 April 1902, *PC.*

[42] Root to Baldwin, 18 November 1905, Miscellaneous Letters Sent regarding Consular Affairs, RG 59, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD [henceforth: *NARA*]. See also Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Report No. 112 on S. 1345, 10 January 1906, *PC,* 7.

Americanize the American consular service and keep it Americanized," they thundered; "for while we must have a foreign service there is no good reason why we should have a subservice of foreigners." Reforming the consular service would ensure that "no American consular shield and no American flag will be placed above foreign soil, unless a representative American citizen is placed beneath these to take care of the business of the American government."[43]

Not *all* American citizens, however, were cut out to transact "the business of the American government." DuBois, who like Wilson feared that the wrong kind of foreign service reform would produce "dry rot," spoke out forcefully against enrolling effete and bookish men in the consular corps. Overreliance on "the merit of the mind" rather than the "merit of the man," he warned, would "give us a corps of educated and gentlemanly theorists as little capable of discharging the practical duties of a consul as they would be of charging up San Juan Hill on the gossamer wings of a butterfly."[44] Wilson shared this conviction. "[I]t is fully recognized," he wrote in 1911, "that a dilettante service of scholarly but unpractical men might lead to a degree of inefficiency hardly less than that often found in the hopeless days of the 'spoils system.'"[45]

A second reform provided a solution: the State Department would manipulate the diplomatic and consular oral exams in order to identify suitable specimens of American

---

[43] Austin A. Burnham, speech to the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations, 9 March 1908, *PC*. Burnham is quoting DuBois.
[44] "Statement of Hon. James T. Dubois."
[45] Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson, "The Consular Service: Assistant Secretary of State Huntington Wilson, '98, Urges Need for Capable Men," *Yale Daily News*, 29 March 1909.

manhood. The Board of the Consular Service, tasked with designing a prototype exam in 1905, succinctly explained the logic behind their proposal:

> The mere academic education requisite to pass a competitive examination, although important, is but a part of the equipment necessary for the development of a high-grade consular officer. Not less, but rather more important, is the question of character, the possession by the candidate of certain native qualities, confirmed and developed by proper training. He should be first of all a loyal, patriotic American citizen, in good health, with correct habits, industry and recognized energy and ability. He should, in fact, be a representative young man of our country, in the highest and best sense of the term, possessing those personal attributes which well distinguish him as such and qualify him for the duties he is to perform.[46]

What exactly were "those personal attributes"? What sort of men was the oral exam designed to recruit? The records of the Diplomatic Service's examination board, over which Huntington Wilson presided during his tenure as First Assistant Secretary, speak volumes. Wilson and his fellow examiners took one relatively weak candidate to task for being "unduly affected with foreign ways" and having "an exaggerated idea of the importance of 'society'"—he was "probably rather a snob," the board concluded. Another, similar candidate was judged "[m]uch too foreign in appearance and manners; intelligent, without being really clever; not very mature; of superficial judgement, probably." The board's prescription: "[he] should be sent to a post . . . where the influences were ultra-American."[47]

---

[46] "Examinations and Appointments," Part III of report on consular reorganization by the Board of Consular Officers, 1905[?], in "Miscellany, 1895–1905," Box 3, Charles Monroe Dickinson Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

[47] Entry for 17–19 May 1910, in "Reports on Diplomatic Service Entrance Examinations, 1909–24," Box 1, Records of the Board of Examiners, General Records, 1873–1947, RG 59, *NARA.*
Minutes of the Board of Examiners, NARA.

Lurking just beneath the surface of this bizarre suggestion was the fear that, once they took up their stations abroad, vulnerable diplomats and consuls would be subject to corrupting or expatriating influences rather than "ultra-American" ones. But the reformers thought they had found a way of dealing with this threat as well. The real problem, they argued, was not so much corruption or expatriation *per se* but the difficulty of monitoring and disciplining foreign service officers working so far from home. "Of course," Elihu Root explained to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, "[if] you send a man to a place where he is not known, where he is free from the restraints upon his conduct that are thrown about a man in the community where he lives and where he is known, and where what he does is going to affect public opinion and the opinion of his friends—free him from these restraints and there is no telling what he is going to do."[48] This line of reasoning helped justify making two more changes to the administrative architecture of the foreign service.

In order to keep an eye on consular officers working in the field, the State Department established a dedicated corps of "Consuls-General-at-Large" who would perform regular inspections of American consulates and produce reports on their personnel. The Consuls-General were supposed to standardize the operations of the service and ensure that it was working as efficiently as possible. But they were also tasked with nipping expatriation in the bud. "We are usually the last people to know" when American consuls went "all to pieces," Root complained. "Rumors come in such a

[48] "Hearing . . . on the Bill . . . to Reorganize the Consular Service," 10.

way that you can not act on them, and we have no way to deal with them." Consular inspection promised to improve the situation dramatically, allowing the State Department to identify corrupt and expatriated officers more quickly and reliably than before.[49] Skeptics in Congress were impressed. In 1906, as the Senate was debating the merits and demerits of the Lodge consular reform bill, Senator James McCreary of Kentucky informed Root that the bill's "saving grace"—"there is no better provision in it"—"is that provision which requires the appointment of five inspectors." McCreary had just finished grilling the Secretary of State about a hypothetical scenario eerily similar to the real one Root would later describe to the House Foreign Affairs Committee: "I want to ask you what is your opinion about a man staying in the consular service a great length of time, where his sons probably take positions in Europe, or in the country where he is at work, and where his daughters marry there. Do you think that in any degree interrupts with or interferes with his official duty?" If the answer was obvious, so was its implication. "If [consuls] do get careless and their daughters marry and their sons go into business there, and they lose their efficiency, the inspectors will find it out, and then you have a chance to remove them," a satisfied McCreary concluded.[50]

Consular inspection was supposed to catch and expel de-Americanized officers. By contrast, the State Department's new personnel management policies were supposed to re-Americanize their colleagues. This was certainly true of Wilson's personnel rotation system, which promised not only to "[bring] members of the foreign service under the

[49] *ibid.*
[50] Report on S. 1345, "Reorganization of the Consular Service," 10 January 1906, *PC.*

eye of the Department" but also to help prevent them from going "stale" and to "[enable] them, after absence, to become again fully in touch with the ideas and policies of their country."[51] Importing field experience to Washington and exporting American values to consulates and legations went hand in hand. "The idea," Wilson explained to a Congressional subcommittee, "is to standardize the ability and unify the ideas and tone of the whole foreign service, and not allow secretaries to stay in foreign countries and become un-American and forget about conditions at home."[52]

What kind of service were all of these changes supposed to create? An article on "Improving the American Diplomat," which Wilson published anonymously in *Harper's Weekly* shortly before he left office, is suggestive:

> In the last few years many young men of the best type have been entering the lower grades of the diplomatic service of the United States with the desire to make a career. These men are working for the government with great devotion in all parts of the world. They are applying themselves with zeal and going without a murmur to do whatever work has been assigned to them, often in places where they are isolated from most of the things which make life agreeable.[53]

Such, at least, was how corporate nationalist reformers like Wilson envisioned the new foreign service they were building. Unfortunately, the public was developing other ideas.

---

[51] Wilson, "American Foreign Service"; Duplicate of Wilson's departmental reorganization plan, September 1906, Folder 3, Doc. 3, *HWP*.
[52] "Hearings on House Resolution 103 to Investigate the Expenditures in the State Department, Etc.," Part I, 10 and 17 May, 1911, *PC*. See also Werking, *Master Architects*, 134.
[53] [Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson], "Improving the American Diplomat."

PART TWO. THE FIRST NIGHTMARE

2.1. "A Few Words Upon Our Much Misunderstood Diplomatic Service"

The germ-seeds of the *Stultitia* Affair lie buried deep in an obscure article Huntington Wilson submitted to the editors of the *National* magazine at the beginning of 1909. Eventually published as an installment of the *National*'s "Story of a Great Nation," a series of educational vignettes depicting "all of the departments and bureaus at Washington," Wilson's article described the administrative structure of the State Department and the duties of some of its employees. But as the article drew to a close, its focus shifted: "At this point," Wilson wrote, "a few words upon the much misunderstood diplomatic service may not be amiss." In fact, the Third Assistant Secretary was understating his concern. As he later explained to the editors of the *National*, his primary object in writing his article had been to "drag down" a couple of "popular misconceptions" about the character of American diplomats.[54]

Two "misconceptions" stood out in Wilson's mind. The first held that foreign policy was beholden to "the ambitions of rulers," whose cynical envoys relied on "[m]ediaeval trickery" in order to realize their cynical objectives. The Third Assistant Secretary assured his readers that this was no longer true. "[D]iplomacy is as good as the national conscience," he declared. "The welfare of peoples . . . is the basis of the

[54] Wilson, "Department of State." Although the article was written in January, the *National* declined to publish it until July, much to Wilson's annoyance. See Wilson to Joe Mitchell Chappell, 19 June 1909, Doc. 131, Folder 1-8, *HWP*; and the archivist's comments on *ibid*. Online version: https://digitalcommons.ursinus.edu/fmhw_other/107/

diplomacy of modern times." As for its practitioners: "[w]hat is wanted today is a good case for one's country and an able man to advocate it." Then came a bit of scolding. "It is very surprising," the Third Assistant Secretary complained, "that there should linger as a heritage from the days gone forever the superficial and conventional idea that diplomacy is polite dishonesty," which survived alongside "such canting and misleading dogmas as the remark that 'a diplomat is an honest man sent [abroad] to lie . . . for his country.'"[55]

Equally pernicious—and equally fallacious—was a second "misconception," which characterized diplomats as effeminate, frivolous expatriates: that is, as

> creatures fashionably attired (preferably in gold lace exclusively), whose occupations are hobnobbing with royalty and aristocracy, quarreling about precedence, and gossiping at afternoon teas; whose chief accomplishments are bowing beautifully and speaking foreign languages well, while forgetting their own; and whose diet consists of truffles and champagne. Persons of the degree of ignorance so to regard the service then ask naively, "What do diplomats do?"

This question, and the caricature to which it was attached, annoyed Wilson immensely. It was time to set the record straight by placing the corporate nationalist vision of American diplomacy before the eyes of the public. "Of course," the Third Assistant Secretary explained,

> an American diplomat should be a plain American gentleman who sets right values on things, avoids affectations, and eschews ostentation. Instead of the foolish attributes he is gratuitously supposed to have, he will have patriotism, education, industry, intelligence, tact and sagacity. These telling qualities he will devote day and night to the advancement of his country's interest.[56]

---

[55] Wilson, "Department of State."
[56] *ibid.*

It was a striking portrait—and as we have seen, Wilson and his colleagues had gone to great lengths in order to make it real. But recruiting "plain American gentlemen" and keeping them "devote[d] day and night" to advancing the national interest would prove, so to speak, to be a task more easily done than said. If the Third Assistant Secretary was proud of the new, Americanized diplomatic service he was building, he was also right to be concerned about its public image. The "misconceptions" identified in his *National* article had already proven capable of stoking significant resistance to foreign service reform; in 1909, they were still very much alive; and before long, they would attach themselves directly to Wilson himself, embroiling him in a heated public debate about the relationship between professional foreign policymakers and the larger American body politic.

2.2. "The American Stroke is the Stroke for Us": Popular Nationalism, Diplomatic Culture, and Opposition to Foreign Service Reform

The debate in question began decades earlier, long before Wilson joined the diplomatic service. Throughout the nineteenth century, American diplomats struggled to fit into the courtly, cosmopolitan world of international politics without overstepping the bounds of American political culture. As David Paull Nickles has shown, "populist" politicians, "closely attuned to the self-confident nationalism of the American public," were only too willing to challenge an alien diplomatic culture they regarded as "effete, aristocratic, and immoral" in the name of revolutionary democracy and "republican simplicity." The difficulty of negotiating this domestic criticism and of striking a balance between national and international standards of conduct transformed the realm of

diplomatic etiquette into a hotly-contested "arena" within which "the US government worked out the tension between the received legacy of the American Revolution and the requirements of a nation assuming a greater role on the international stage."[57]

According to Nickles, this tension began to resolve itself in the 1890s: as the United States grew more deeply entangled with societies beyond its borders, its leaders and citizens grew more willing to let its envoys follow established patterns of behavior. [58] However, elements of the old popular nationalism survived this transformation of the political landscape and periodically reemerged to harass American diplomats and their allies, who remained "painfully aware" of populism's latent strength. It is therefore worth devoting some space in this chapter to exploring populistic challenges to diplomatic culture in greater detail. Wilson's *National* article correctly identified two of them.

2.2.1. ISOLATIONISM AND AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM

The first was an isolationist challenge, rooted in the assumption that diplomatic practice had been tainted by the brutality and cynicism of European geopolitics. Europhobic isolationism enjoyed a brief renaissance as the nineteenth century gave way to the twentieth, with opponents of American overseas expansion trying to revive the crusade against foreign entanglements they associated with George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. "Knavish diplomacy" became one of the evils anti-imperialists saw preserved in the European states system, a sinister construct riven by "fierce contentions,

[57] David Paull Nickles, "US Diplomatic Etiquette during the Nineteenth Century," in Markus Mösslang and Torsten Riotte, eds., *The Diplomats' World: A Cultural History of Diplomacy, 1815–1914* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008), 287–88.
[58] *ibid*., 288. See also Heinrichs, "Bureaucracy and Professionalism," 142–43.

. . . masked hatreds, . . . treacherous alliances, . . . wars and rumors of war."[59] By contrast, as one opponent of the Philippine-American War went out of his way to emphasize, Jefferson had favored maintaining "little or no diplomatic establishment."[60] People who took such views seriously were bound to oppose any attempts by the State Department and its officials to influence American foreign policy. Explaining his opposition to a set of tariffs negotiated by American diplomats, Senator Joseph W. Bailey of Texas, bristling at what he regarded as an attempt to undermine Congressional revenue-raising and treaty-making powers, declared that he had

> [l]ong ago . . . accepted Talleyrand's definition of a diplomat as one who has been sent abroad to lie for the benefit of his country; and I am not willing to permit the taxation of our people be regulated by such in secret conference . . . . As a rule, diplomats know more about social functions than they do about the justice of taxation, and they are far more responsive to special interests than they are to the representatives of the people.[61]

Far more common, and ultimately far more damaging to the State Department, was a second, "American exceptionalist" challenge to international diplomatic culture. It, too, played on popular nationalism and Europhobia. But instead of casting European diplomats as treacherous liars, it dressed them up as effeminate snobs, perfect foils for the manly simplicity of the American Republic's elected leaders. Representative Champ Clark of Missouri, a future Speaker of the House and an inveterate enemy of foreign service reform, captured the spirit of the distinction in an anecdote he relayed to his colleagues in the legislature:

---

[59] *Cong. Rec.* 32 (1899), 612.
[60] *ibid.*, 1005.
[61] *Cong. Rec.* 38 (1903–04), 172.

> A wag out in Missouri once told me that when Andrew Johnson was first sworn in as Vice-President, in looking up at the Senate diplomatic gallery, he happened to catch sight of the representatives of the foreign governments up there, and, shaking his fist at them, said: 'You aristocratic cockadoodles, go back to your royal masters and tell them that in the land of the setting sun you saw a tailor and a rail-splitter climb to the apex of human power.' [Laughter.]

"That," Clark concluded with pride, "is a gorgeous sentence—a patriotic sentiment"—and it made it clear that, as far as the Representative from Missouri was concerned, officials claiming to represent the United States before the eyes of the world ought to be able to distinguish themselves from any European "aristocratic cockadoodles" they might encounter.[62]

Consequently, when the etiquette controversy began to flame out at the turn of the century, exceptionalists like Clark worked hard to keep the embers burning. And as Wilson recognized, one particularly effective way of doing this involved focusing public attention on the dress codes—the "fashionable attire" and the "gold lace"—many diplomats chose to wear while carrying out their official duties.

The dress-code debate was far from new. Throughout the nineteenth century, the prevailing popular nationalist wisdom insisted that American envoys wear relatively simple clothing instead of the elaborate uniforms favored by many of their aristocratic European homologues. But by the 1890s, a growing number of American opinion-makers, convinced that the United States was on its way to becoming a mature world power, had turned against this upstart practice. Mark Twain spoke for many when, a year after the end of the Spanish-American War, he wrote that the "Great Republic" had

---

[62] *Cong. Rec.* 34 (1901), 744.

"lengthened her skirts . . . , balled up her hair, and entered the world's society. This means that, if she would prosper and stand fair with society, she must put aside some of her dearest and darlingest young ways and superstitions, and do as society does." The most outrageous of the Republic's "superstitions" was its longstanding insistence that American diplomats serving in Europe present themselves in plain swallow-tail coats rather than formal court dress. Wearing the swallow-tail, argued Twain, functioned as "a pretty loud and pious rebuke to the vain and frivolous costumes" favored by the Europeans. In short, it was precisely the kind of gratuitous gesture of defiance Clark and his idol, Andrew Johnson, might have celebrated. Not so Twain. "[O]ur non-conforming swallow-tail," he complained, "is a declaration of ungracious independence . . . , an offence against foreign manners and customs; and the discredit of it falls upon the nation."[63]

The exceptionalists, however, suspected that the modern obsession with proper attire signified weakness, not dignity. "[I]n th' arly days iv this raypublic," observed Peter Finley Dunne's Mr. Dooley in 1906,

> no wan cared what an [American] ambassadure wore, so long as it had pockets enough to carry away what he got f'r his beloved counthry fr'm th' effeet monarchies iv th' ol' wurruld. . . . In thim simple days, whin th' fathers of th' raypublic wanted to skin a king, they put their heads together an' picked out a good, active, thravellin' salesman kind iv a man.

But "thim simple days" were long past. "It's different now that we've become a wurruld power," Mr. Dooley explained to his friend Mr. Hennesy. "The sufferin's iv some iv our

[63] Mark Twain, "Diplomatic Pay and Clothes," 1899, reprinted in *Forum* XCV/3 (1936). See also Heinrichs, "Bureaucracy and Professionalism," 142–43; Nickles, "US Diplomatic Etiquette," 294–304.

ambassadures on account of their clothes has been turr'ble."[64] It was a statement dripping with irony. Eager to compete on an even footing with aristocratic European rivals, Americans diplomats now had to look and dress the part—and as a result, they had become slaves to the "effeet monarchies" whose kings they were trying to "skin."

A tall tale sufficed to illustrate the scale of the problem. The American ambassador to Russia had recently decided to start wearing an elaborate uniform to public functions. According to Mr. Dooley, the results had impressed the Russians—but it had also enfeebled the ambassador and his country. "At last America takes its thrue station among th' nations iv th' earth," Mr. Dooley imagined the Tsar exclaiming on catching sight of the American envoy. However, what the Russian monarch said next revealed America's new "station" to be an embarrassingly subordinate one: "[N]iver since king and tailor jined together to rule the wurruld, has human legs been encased in so happy a pair of bloomers." Why had a representative of the proud American Republic submitted to the dictates of "king and tailor"? The answer was equally troubling: on a previous occasion, when the ambassador had appeared at court dressed in ordinary clothing, one of the Tsar's attendants had mistaken him for a waiter. When Mr. Hennesy asked why this fate had never befallen the famously unostentatious Benjamin Franklin during his stint as Ambassador to France, his friend's response revealed how far the American foreign service had fallen since Franklin's day. "[E]ven in th' prisince in a king," Mr. Dooley declared, "Binjamin Franklin niver felt like a waiter."[65]

---

[64] *ibid.*, 97–99.
[65] *ibid.*, 97–99.

2.2.2. Technological Change and the Obsolescence of Diplomacy

Was a return to the good old "simple days" possible? Some critics of the diplomatic service thought not. High-speed transportation, long-distance telegraphy, and the rise of mass media—all of these things, claimed the critics, had rendered diplomacy obsolete: "If me frind Prisidint Tiddy wants to know what's goin' on annywhere," drawled Mr. Dooley, "all he has to do is subscribe to th' pa-apers." The result was a sadly emasculated kind of foreign service: "To be an ambassadure, all a man needs is to have a wife want to live in Europe; to be a first sicrety he must be a good walzer; to be a sicond sicrety he must know how to press clothes an' take care iv childher."[66] Encounters with the titled heads of Europe thus looked nothing like the one Representative Clark had celebrated. Mr. Dooley described the sad fate of a new ambassador who, having learned the local language and "the two-step," presents himself at the royal court to which he has been accredited—only to have his homespun American dignity fall away. "As he enthers with a martial sthride th' speech he prepared in Jersey City slips his mind, he falls aisily on a rug into a settin' or a kneelin' posture, and the king mutters a few kindly wurruds in th' language that th' ambassadure used to shoot at whin he was in the milishy, an' all is over."[67]

Mr. Dooley's anecdote implicitly raised a troubling question: what effect would a life of indolence abroad have on the character of American consuls and diplomats? Might they fall prey to overcivilization and expatriation? Foreign service reformers thought they

[66] *ibid.*, 88.
[67] *ibid.*, 91.

had worked out how to counteract these forces; others remained concerned. Their lingering doubts were serious enough to work their way into one of the subplots of a novella by O. Henry. The action of *Cabbages and Kings* (1906) takes place in a fictitious, absurdly exoticized Caribbean port town—the author introduces the setting by comparing it to "some vacuous beauty lounging in a guarded harem"—which has seduced a bored, underworked American consul. Having all but given up on his laughably trivial official duties, the consul has "eaten of the lotus" and fallen in love with both the town and the mixed-race daughter of an American merchant who has set up a permanent residence there. As he adapts to the sleepy lifestyle of his adoptive home, the consul's sense of nationality begins to fade away, and time—the ultimate marker of modern, industrial productivity—seems to vanish altogether. "The old days of life in the United States seemed like an irritating dream," noted O. Henry. As for the consul's new "life of perpetual afternoon": "The climate as balmy as that of distant Avalon; the fetterless, idyllic round of enchanted days; the life among this indolent, romantic people—a life full of music, flowers, and low laughter [. . .]—with all of that, he was more than content."[68]

The wrong sort of consular posting threatened to emasculate and expatriate its occupants, but critics of the foreign service generally accepted that consuls, as commercial agents of the United States, had important work to do. By contrast, only degenerates and effete Europhiles seemed well-suited to life in the diplomatic corps.[69]

---

[68] O. Henry, *Cabbages and Kings*, in *The Complete Works of O. Henry* (Garden City, NY: Garden City Publishing Company, 1937), 542, 551.

[69] On the differences between the reputations of the two services, see Werking, *Master Architects*, 121–22. As Werking points out, even some supporters of consular reform looked down on the diplomatic corps. Meanwhile, in Congress, opponents of foreign service reform occasionally proposed abolishing the

"Ye don't see anybody nowadays that stands a chanct to be ilictid sheriff thryin' to be ambassadure anywhere," quipped Mr. Dooley. Unfortunately, this meant that "[a]n ambassadure is a man that is no more use abroad than he wud be at home": the average specimen was a crook, a washed-up politician, or "a milishy gin'ral whose fam'ly wants to larn Fr-rinch without the aid iv a teacher."[70] Representative Francis Burton Harrison of New York, expressed a slightly different but equally low opinion of American diplomats on the floor of the House. The telegraph, he complained to his colleagues in 1908, had transformed ambassadors into glorified "messenger-boys. . . . Thus it has come about that in the selection of diplomats in the last decade more attention seems to be paid to external appearance than to the man himself":

> The modern tendency . . . is to select dinner table diplomats or dietetic diplomats. The modern ambassadors are selected apparently because of their riches, and the under secretaries because of their club membership in the exclusive clubs at home; the rich men because they may be able to give banquets and thereby, as the old saying is, " reach the heart" of the foreign monarch through his stomach. The under secretaries, not perhaps because they are able to give these banquets, but because of the table manners with which they are possessed, so that they may fill the definition of gentility given by Chaucer when he held up to succeeding generations for admiration the picture of a perfect lady as one who 'let no morsel from her lippes drop.'[71]

At times, the supposed obsolescence of the diplomatic corps and the alleged inferiority of its personnel threatened to jeopardize the institution's very survival. In 1897, Representative Clark called, half seriously, for the abolition of the diplomatic corps, which "was never useful, and sometimes . . . not . . . even ornamental. [Laughter.]"

---

diplomatic corps in order to free up more money for consuls. *ibid*., 122; *Cong. Rec.* 45 (1910), 3034; *Cong. Rec.* 46 (1911), 2102.

[70] Dunne, *Dissertations*, 88.

[71] *Cong. Rec.* 42 (1908), 4921.

To provide support for his claim, the Representative from Missouri proposed an experiment: "I could take one newspaper correspondent out of that gallery, send him to Europe, and in a month he would find out more about affairs over there than the entire gang of ambassadors, ministers plenipotentiary, and envoys extraordinary can find out between now and next Christmas. [Laughter.]"[72] At the beginning of 1911, when supporters of foreign service reform urged Congress to purchase more dignified embassy buildings around the world—a proposal immediately denounced as a wasteful concession to "dress parade" diplomats, to "extravagant and rich Americans" seeking to "exploit their wealth in the presence of royalty"—Representative Oscar Underwood of Alabama revived Clark's idea. Exchanging ambassadors in an era of mass communication, he argued, was "as antiquated and out of date as . . . riding in a stage coach" when railroad trains were available.[73]

2.2.3. EXCEPTIONALIST DEFENSES OF THE SPOILS SYSTEM

Underwood, Clark, Harrison, and Mr. Dooley had attacked modern diplomacy in general. However, a different strain of American exceptionalist thought took aim specifically at the foreign service reform movement. Its most eloquent exponent was the historian Edward Grosvenor, who presented his views to the American Historical Association at the end of 1898. The resulting paper, published the next year in the Association's *Annual Report*, married exceptionalism's masculinist ethos to a robust defense of the Spoils System.

---

[72] *Cong. Rec.* 30 (1897), 271.
[73] *Cong. Rec.* 46 (1911), 2098–2102.

Grosvenor began, in classical academic fashion, by trying to define the word "diplomacy." Along the way, he paused to explore some of the same "misconceptions" Wilson would later address in his *National* article:

> In many a mind to the word 'diplomacy' attaches a subtle meaning, as of something abstruse, mysterious, almost magical or necromantic. It is supposed to employ language like a juggler, not for the purpose of expressing but of concealing thought, and thereby diverting attention from a trick. Its methods are to be tortuous, and its object is not to be approached direct, but by windings and detours. Like Napoleon's army at Verona, it marches westward when about to attack an enemy which is encamped behind it toward the east. And so the second definition given by Bescherelle is often acknowledged as the true meaning, "Diplomacy is skill in deceit." Thus was it taught by Machiavelli before the modern name was coined. Thus was it practiced by Talleyrand.
>
> But there is another and, I think, a still more common acceptation of the term. Said a lady to me once, "I just dote on diplomacy. It is so sweet; it is just lovely." The occasion of her satisfaction was a ball at a European embassy in Vienna . . . . To her [diplomacy] was represented by the courtly bearing of the gentlemen, by their assiduous devotion to their partners, by the Parisian toilet of the ladies, by the sound on many a lip of the most polite and cosmopolitan of tongues, by the stirring music and the twinkling feet, by the atmosphere of luxury and polish, whence the uncouth was excluded and where none could enter unless to the manner born. Thus to a great number diplomacy means ability to speak French, to wear a dress suit without embarrassment, to pay a well-timed compliment, to make a graceful bow, to be master of the latest table etiquette and of the visiting card—above all, to be neither rustic nor awkward.

Unlike Wilson, Grosvenor did not directly contest these views. But he did make it clear that neither was totally satisfactory. So, borrowing from the writings of well-known diplomats and the "Standard Dictionary," he articulated his own, more complete definition: diplomacy was "the art or science of international relations," and its object was "the defense of the members of a State in their interests and their rights. The dignity of the sovereign, whether a crowned ruler or an uncrowned people, and the character of

that sovereign for integrity, decency, and comity are to be maintained by acts and words, and also by the demeanor of accredited authorities."[74]

It was a view not dissimilar to Wilson's. However, Grosvenor allowed his definition to develop in a different direction: if diplomats "represented [the] interests" and embodied the "character" the of whatever entity held sovereign authority within a polity, then different kinds of polity might end up practicing "the art or science of international relations" in distinct ways, according to their own values and customs. As a result, in the course of their duties, diplomats would distill and project onto the international stage the characteristic virtues—and the characteristic vices—of the regimes they served. "The diplomacy of every nation," explained Grosvenor, "must emanate from the home government as from a fountain head. . . . As the rills, clear or turbid, sweet or brackish, reveal the nature of their source, so inevitably by natural law does the embassy indicate the nature of the government and the nation which it represents."[75]

This assertion set up a powerful contrast between European and American diplomatic practice. The former, contended Grosvenor, had been "debauched" by authoritarian monarchs like Louis XIV, who had been responsible for "[giving] to diplomacy its European form." The policies of Louis' ministers had combined "the acuteness and cunning of the weak" with "the overbearing arrogance of the strong." As for Louis himself: "He was always an actor on a royal stage, and his diplomacy was false

[74] Edward A. Grosvenor, "American Diplomacy," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1898* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899), 288–89.
[75] *ibid*., 289–90.

and artificial like himself. . . . Inwardly it was a tissue of unprincipled craft, with its chief ambition to overreach and deceive." On the outside, by contrast, all was "pomp and ceremony and glitter."[76] Here, it seemed, lay the origins of both Talleyrandian cunning and the effete courtliness Grosvenor's female acquaintance had found so captivating.

How strikingly different things looked on the other side of the Atlantic! American diplomatic institutions (contended Grosvenor) were far more democratic than those of Europe, and as a result, a more transparent—and more masculine—set of political principles governed their operation. "[D]irectness, frankness, honesty, tact": these, argued Grosvenor, had been "traits of the great majority [of American ambassadors] from the day of Washington and Jefferson to our own."[77] American diplomats were also exposed to the vicissitudes of domestic politics in a way their European counterparts were not:

> The European diplomatist still inhabits a half-mediaeval castle, almost impregnable to criticism and difficult of access except to a privileged few, . . . hedged around by privacy and reserve and traditional customs, like his queen or his kaiser or his tzar [*sic*.]. The American diplomatist is merely an American citizen, but occupied with public life and resident abroad; his doors always open to all.[78]

Finally, the Senate, by exercising its right to make and ratify treaties, injected a certain amount of democratic spirit into the policymaking process. "Let us rejoice," declared Grosvenor, that in the Senate chamber, "men trained in the classic halls of Bowdoin and Dartmouth and Princeton and Harvard and Yale" sat beside others "trained in the larger college of the farm, the factory, and the counting-house, and that to them all equally

---

[76] *ibid*., 290.
[77] *ibid*., 295.
[78] *ibid*., 296.

every treaty of arbitration, of alliance, of peace, must be submitted for final arbitrament. And we may furthermore rejoice that, by the wise provision of our fathers, in that august assembly the opulent States and the cultured States and the historic States count no more than the stalwart though newly born States of the West."[79]

As should be clear by now, Grosvenor's analysis of European and American diplomacy was not impartial; its object was to illustrate the superiority of the American system. The laurels manly American diplomats had won in Europe during the Revolutionary era stood as cases in point. Describing the character of John Adams, Grosvenor quoted George Bancroft: "[T]he attention of Europe was drawn to this sturdy diplomatist who dared, alone and unsupported, to initiate so novel and bold a procedure" as demanding immediate satisfaction from the Dutch government. But like Mr. Dooley, Grosvenor believed that Benjamin Franklin deserved the highest praise. Franklin, he declared, "towered as the ablest diplomat of the eighteenth century"; he had blown through France, still stifling under the dead hand of Bourbon autocracy, "like a fresh and invigorating breeze from the western wilds." Grosvenor described the resulting clash of cultures with an astoundingly phallic simile: "like Ithuriel's spear," the American diplomat's "republican simplicity" had "approached the intrenched methods of duplicity and deception" and made them "[shrivel] at his touch."[80] The conclusion was obvious. "There is no better training for the real business of European diplomacy than the practical school of American politics," Grosvenor declared. "It is a better training than is afforded

[79] *ibid.*, 292–93.
[80] *ibid.*, 290–92.

by the inherited blood of an ambassadorial line or by the partiality of a prince *or*"—and here was the kicker—"*by the routine from childhood in the monotony of office*."[81]

As his article drew to a close, Grosvenor expanded upon this final point. "I am well aware," he wrote, "that many are clamorous for the adoption of what is called the European system of diplomacy." What Grosvenor called the "European system" was, in fact, the kind of system favored by the professional diplomats: "It is supposed to offer a large career, to insure greater permanence in position, and to possess higher efficiency than our own."[82] But Grosvenor thought otherwise. Not only had the existing infrastructure of American diplomacy proven to be highly effective; it had also exposed the weaknesses of its European rival several times over. A fable rammed the point home:

> This year . . . three famous universities held a regatta. One crew rowed with a foreign stroke, . . . one with an American stroke. . . . In the van flashed the boat propelled by the stroke of their American sires . . . ; the gallant crew . . . which had now been taught a foreign training, was left behind.
> In diplomacy the American stroke is the stroke for us, . . . not because of provincial prejudice or national pride, but because of the facts of history.[83]

Thus, supporters of the Spoils System like Grosvenor insisted that the status quo produced masculine, patriotic diplomats. Of course, Wilson and his colleagues insisted that foreign service reform would do the same. The stage had been set for an epic clash of worldviews. Wilson would be one of its protagonists—and one of its victims.

---

[81] *ibid*., 294.
[82] *ibid*., 298.
[83] *ibid*., 300.

2.3. The "Under Secretary" Controversy of 1909

The trouble started at the beginning of 1909, around the time Wilson submitted his *National* article for publication. The Third Assistant Secretary had put pen to paper with a special sense of urgency. "My sole object," he later explained to the magazine's editors, "was that [the article] should be printed this spring," when the task of "drag[ging] down . . . popular misconceptions" had seemed "for many reasons . . . to be more than ordinarily opportune." He was right.

On 13 January, the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations endorsed an appropriations bill amendment which, if passed, would give the State Department a new chief administrative officer: an "Under Secretary of State," whose salary would be higher and functions wider in scope than those of the existing First Assistant Secretary. Other amendments to the bill authorized further additions to the Department's staff and provided for the creation of a fourth Assistant Secretaryship. The political momentum behind the proposals had come from Senators Shelby Cullom of Illinois, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Philander Knox of Pennsylvania, who was on his way to becoming Secretary of State under the newly-elected President William Howard Taft. The ideas, however, came from Wilson, whose plans for rebuilding the State Department called for the creation of more higher-level administrative positions under the aegis of a "Vice-Secretary," a "Secretary-General," or—finally—an Under Secretary. Together, the new administrators would sit with the Secretary of State on the "Political Committee." But it was the Under Secretary who would really run hold the reins of power, functioning as a policy advisor, "supreme director" of the foreign service, and a liaison officer

keeping the Department in touch with Congress, the press, and foreign diplomats.[84] "The more I reflect," Wilson told Knox in February 1909, "the more I am convinced that the duties of the Under Secretary should not be defined or limited in their scope." Far from it, in fact: "the Under Secretary should be the alter ego and understudy of the Secretary of State."[85]

No wonder, then, that Wilson was so eager in January 1909 to shore up the foreign service's public image. And at first, the political winds seemed to be blowing his way: on 15 January, the Senate followed the Foreign Relations Committee's recommendation and ratified the Under Secretary amendment. But four days later, dark clouds appeared on the horizon. A handful of Senators began to express reservations about using the term "Under Secretary," which (as supporters of the amendment were happy to acknowledge) had an Anglophonic tenor. Augustus Bacon of Georgia proposed "Vice-Secretary" as a more "peculiarly . . . American" title for the new office; more ominously, Charles Culberson of Texas thought the original title smacked of "monarchy": "[I]t strikes me that Under Secretary of State is a bit out of the ordinary, in our country at least." The magnitude of the Undersecretary's salary increase and the expense of the other administrative changes at the State Department did not help matters.

---

[84] For a concise history of the Undersecretary amendment and Wilson's involvement, see Werking, *Master Architects*, 144, 146–47. See also the unsigned notes on the legislative history of the Under Secretary amendment, Folder 8, Doc. 2, *HWP*; the untitled memorandum on the various amendments, Folder 8, Doc. 4, *HWP*; and Wilson to Knox, 2 February 1909, Folder 8, Doc. 5, *HWP*. On the role and duties of the Undersecretary, the various Assistant Secretaries, and the "Political Committee" under Wilson's reform scheme, see the duplicate of the departmental reorganization plan, *HWP*; "Memorandum Regarding Necessity of an Under Secretary," Folder 8, Doc. 3, *HWP*; and Wilson to Knox, 2 February 1909.
[85] Wilson to Knox, 2 February 1909.

"I would be glad," continued Culberson, "to know what necessity there is for creating these additional offices."[86]

The next month, things got worse. On 2 February, an anxious Wilson queried Knox about "Anglophobia" in the House of Representatives, where opposition to the "Under Secretary" designation was rumored to be on the rise. Perhaps a name change was in order, as Augustus Bacon had suggested. "[M]ight not 'Vice Secretary,' 'Secretary General,' or 'Principal Assistant Secretary' be a suitable alternative?"[87] Then, in mid-February, the irrepressible Champ Clark launched a second kind of attack on Wilson's pet amendment. On the 17th, the Representative from Missouri delivered a blistering speech on the floor of the House in which he accused Congress of striking a corrupt bargain with Knox, luring him into the State Department by offering to supply the Secretary of State's office with an extra $19,500 every year. The bribe, alleged Clark, was to be paid out in the form of salaries for the Department's new administrative officers, including the Under Secretary and the Fourth Assistant Secretary. Underlying this startling accusation was the assumption that, thanks to the simplicity of American foreign relations, the personnel changes Wilson and Knox had proposed were unnecessary. Qualified isolationism once again reared its ugly head. "We are at peace with all the world," exclaimed an exasperated Clark. "There are no complications . . . except with two countries. One of them amounts to very little, and the other is being settled amicably; and it is strange that in a time of profound peace, with nothing

[86] *Cong. Rec.* 43 (1909), 1097–98.
[87] Wilson to Knox, 2 February 1909.

increasing the business and work of the office of the Secretary of State, we are to appropriate an extra $19,500 a year to secure the services of one man"—that is, Knox. "I will not vote for it," warned Clark; "and it does not seem to me that any man on the floor of the House ought to vote for it." Ominously, this final statement was greeted by "[a]pplause on the Democratic side."[88]

The next week, the storm broke. On 23 February, with the appropriations bill stalled in a conference committee, the Under Secretary amendment rolled back into the House. There, on the 24th, it ignited an extraordinarily vigorous and long-winded debate on the 24th—towards the end, participants found themselves besieged by cries of "Vote, vote!" from less patient colleagues. At issue were more than just titles and salaries: opponents of the amendment heaped scorn upon the foreign service as an institution, stereotyping diplomats as social parasites living large at Washington's expense. "[S]maller fleas [feeding] upon the larger fleas" was the uncharitable metaphor one Representative used to describe the new Under Secretary's clerical staff. The only reason James Mann of Illinois could find for appointing an Under Secretary and a Fourth Assistant Secretary was to "provide places for two additional people." That would make "[s]ix Secretaries of State! They are now so thick that the Secretaries of State in that department fall over each other in the halls. [Laughter.]" The image was especially ridiculous because, in Mann's view, "[t]he Department of State has less work to do than any other department of the Government." When one Representative suggested that

[88] *Cong. Rec.* 43 (1909), 2573.

Secretary of State Knox, relieved of some of his duties by the new Under Secretary, would find more time for "intellectual" work, Mann cut him off to add, derisively: "—and dinner giving."[89]

None of this pleased Wilson. In a long memorandum addressed to the House of Representatives, he sternly reminded the lower chamber of its "duty . . . to give serious and unprejudiced attention" to the Under Secretary proposal, about which "there is evidence of some little misunderstanding." The concerns with monarchy and "Anglomania" he dismissed as absurd. Ditto Champ Clark's suggestion that "because our foreign relations are now happily rather serene, we should, therefore, not make an additional appropriations to the Department of State." Wilson's reply made Clark look like a fool: "We do not, when the crops go out, cut out as unnecessary the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture!" [90]

The caricatures of diplomats as parasites required more somewhat elaborate demolition. In what may have been a direct response to Representative Mann's "dinner-giving" joke, Wilson stressed the difficulty of the State Department's "intellectual work." The "usefulness" of diplomats and consuls, insisted the Assistant Secretary, "depends entirely on the wisdom and lucidity of the instructions they receive. The daily guidance of over a hundred diplomatic officers and about three thousand consular officers in every quarter of the world and urgently requiring instructions and decisions upon almost every conceivable subject is no easy task." Why had the House failed to grasp this? The reason,

---

[89] *ibid.*, 3037–43; unsigned notes on the legislative history of the Under Secretary amendment, *HWP*.
[90] Untitled memorandum, Folder 8, Doc. 4, *HWP*.

Wilson surmised, was that diplomacy often had to "go on in silence, unobserved and unappreciated except when attention is drawn to it by some new treaty, trade agreement, or the like actually affecting the interests of every American citizen." Nevertheless, the State Department's "unobtrusive" work was of "vital importance," something Congress would do well to remember. After all, it was the "destiny" of the United States to become a world power, and as such, the country would need "a thoroughly efficient State Department and foreign service." "I hope," sniffed Wilson, "[. . .] that we shall not deny to this little-understood Department the right to a logical expansion commensurate with the international position, the commerce, the population, the wealth, and the pride of the American people."[91]

Thus, in his attempt to force Congress into line, Wilson reproduced in a more anxious register the pleas for "support and intelligent public interest" he had included in his *National* article back in January. But it was no use. At Clark's instigation, the House not only declined to ratify the Under Secretary amendment but actually insisted, via a floor vote, that its delegates to the appropriations bill conference committee maintain their opposition to its inclusion in the bill's text. On 3 March, the outgoing Senate withdrew its support as well. Wilson and his allies had lost.[92]

There followed an embarrassing coda. Just two days after the amendment's demise, Wilson received a promotion, becoming First Assistant Secretary of State. The *Saturday Evening Post* marked the occasion with a tongue-in-cheek "Who's Who"

---

[91] *ibid.*

[92] *Cong. Rec.* 43 (1909), 3042–43; notes on the legislative history of the "Undersecretary" amendment.

profile, casting the new Assistant Secretary as an exemplar of overcivilized expatriation, complete with English accent. The new Assistant Secretary, imagined the *Post*, was a man who "takes tea every afternoon at hawf after four," and so, "for the pleasant time when Huntington is eating his wafers and brewing his tea, all the clerks become clarks and it really seems like dear old Downing Street" at the State Department. His promotion had thus "avenged" the death blow the Senate had inflicted upon the Under Secretary proposal—"the sort of truck," the *Post* had Congress explain to a corrupt, golf-playing Knox, "that we got rid of when we chased the English off our map." More importantly, though, it would prove to the "powdered and pompous diplomatists" fielded by "older and more effete nations" that the American foreign service could beat them at their own game. For too long, declared the *Post* with mock outrage, Europeans had sneered at the "shirt-sleeve diplomacy" of the United States, carried out by "rough-necked and robust young patriots" sent abroad via the spoils system. But they could never sneer at the new Assistant Secretary. A photograph of Wilson, immaculately dressed and sporting *pince-nez*, was worth a thousand words: "He never appeared anywhere in shirt-sleeves in his life," read the caption. The conclusion was obvious: "Shirt-sleeve diplomacy? Not on your gold lace and decorations. Our diplomacy is now in full evening dress."[93]

2.4. *Stultitia* as Self-Portrait

In light of the embarrassment caused by the "Under Secretary" controversy, it is hardly surprising that, when Wilson set about writing his fictionalized account of life in

[93] "Full-Dress Diplomacy," *Saturday Evening Post*, "1909" (handwritten in margin), *HWP*.

the foreign service at the beginning of 1913, he opted to substitute his vision of the reformed diplomatic service for the one his critics had tried to superimpose onto him in 1909. Hence his characterization of *Stultitia*'s protagonists, both of whom personify the Wilson ethos.

John Drake, a State Department official who serves as a stand-in for Huntington Wilson himself, possesses all the qualities of an ideal professional diplomat. "[R]ather pale, slim, but strongly built, . . . [h]e has a very earnest and grave address . . . relieved by a pleasant urbanity."[94] Although his exact position within the administrative structure of the foreign service is never fully clarified, Wilson at one point identified as the head of his Department's "Political Bureau"—that is, of the "Political Committee" Wilson had sought to create.[95] This is clearly a role of some import; Drake is very probably a senior Assistant Secretary like Wilson—or, perhaps, the proposed Under Secretary himself. His loyalty to the United States, however, is unimpeachable. When a meddling Congressman threatens to deny Drake an ambassadorial position on the grounds that he "never did anything" for the Congressman's political party, Drake replies coolly: "That's alright . . . . You work for the party and I'll work for the country."[96]

Even more striking than Drake is his friend and ally Captain Hawk, who serves as an adjutant to the Army's Chief of Staff, General Middleton. Wilson endows Hawk, the play's most dynamic character, with the "clean-cut features and rather high cheekbones

---

[94] Wilson, *Stultitia*, 39.
[95] *ibid.*, 147.
[96] *ibid.*, 45.

and the spare figure of a type of simon-pure American."[97] Such racial signifiers matter in the world of *Stultitia,* where physiognomy betrays genealogy. Sure enough, Hawk is a quintessential "old-stock" Northeasterner, who jokes with General Middleton's equally high-born daughter that "[y]our ancestors have been here as long as mine. No, I beat you by ten years, we got here in 1630."[98] This ancestry has brought with it great wealth, but Hawk refuses to abandon himself to luxury, instead working and apparently living out of a "simple and spare" War Department office. There he sleeps after toiling late into the night, dressed, according to the stage directions, "in his shirt sleeves." Not a whiff of champagne, not a trace of gold lace mars the atmosphere of spartan patriotism which hangs over the opening scene, when an exhausted Hawk is awakened at his desk by the War Department's Irish-American charwoman, Mrs. Riley. "Why don't ye enjoy yourself?" asks Mrs. Riley, feeling sorry for the overworked Captain. "It's not for a livin yer wurrikin'—you with all thim automobiles n' foine horses." "Well, you see," replies Hawk, "I love my country . . . . So I suppose I like to work for it."[99]

Hawk and Drake are not understated characters—they are emphatically manly and emphatically American, often to the point of melodramatic excess. But Wilson opts to drive his point home even more firmly by surrounding his protagonists with supporters and foils, all of whom set up extra opportunities for the author to affirm and glorify the Americanism of his professional policymakers. The first to appear are Miss Middleton

---

[97] *ibid.,* 11.
[98] *ibid.,* 21.
[99] *ibid.,* 11, 15–16.

and Miss Turner, who eventually marry Drake and Hawk, respectively. Miss Middleton, the aforementioned daughter of General Middleton, is a fiery patriot in her own right, making her (in Wilson's eye, at least) an ideal match for Drake. Although Miss Middleton initially seems to rebuff her suitor, their self-abnegating love of country eventually draws them together, resulting in what must be one of the strangest wedding engagement announcements in the history of theater. "I'm going to marry Mr. Drake," Miss Middleton declares to the President, of all people. "I found out this evening that he loves his country more than he loves me. That's why."[100] Hawk's courtship of Miss Turner is more conventional and proceeds largely offstage. But in his decision to pursue the hand of a woman whose middle-class background is far humbler than his own subtly lends emphasizes his faith in the value of classless social unity. Shortly after meeting Miss Turner, he explains in her presence that, unlike in Europe,

> in America we have no "classes"; we have no "proletariat" in the fixed and continuous sense . . . and we don't want them. . . . Just as a family hangs together that the young may be reared, the aged supported, and the members live decently and well, so our great American family is going to hang together for the benefit of all its members. Patriotism is the filial piety of the nation.[101]

Hence, presumably, Hawk's delight at discovering in Miss Turner "a simple American girl of the old school, without any European airs—and with serious ideas."[102]

The sober Americanism of the professional policymakers and their romantic partners stands out all the more when set against the vices of the effete, Europhile Barney

---

[100] *ibid*., 131.
[101] *ibid*., 78.
[102] *ibid*., 127.

family. At its head stands Mrs. Barney, a snob who speaks "with a mincing accent she fondly thinks sounds English," treats foreign ambassadors with fawning adoration, and talks incessantly about court life on the opposite side of the Atlantic. About her own country she knows little and cares less—so much so, indeed, that during a White House reception she fails to recognize and stand for "The Star-Spangled Banner." "Is this our national anthem?" she asks when challenged by an irritated Captain Hawk. "Why, I thought it had the same tune as 'God Save the Queen.'"[103] Mrs. Barney's daughter Sibyl has carried this kind of thinking to its logical conclusion by marrying Baron Gadding, a high-born European official working against the United States in Latin America. To Miss Middleton, Sibyl's behavior seems almost treasonous: "I can't see how our girls can do it, giving up their country, taking their fortunes abroad, raising sons for foreign armies. What should we think of our men if they gave up on their country so lightly?"[104]

Sibyl's brother Charles has not gone quite that far. But he, more than any other character in *Stultitia*, is the antithesis of Hawk, Drake, and the virile, austerely professional patriotism they embody. Charles toys with the idea of joining the army or the foreign service; he also competes indirectly with Drake for the affections of Miss Middleton. There is little hope for him on either front, though, because overcivilization and expatriation have so thoroughly emasculated him. When an obviously frustrated Miss Middleton asks him point blank about his personal and professional ambitions, Charles—who, according to a stage direction, "has rather an affected and finicky way, due to too

[103] *ibid*., 93–94, 100, 117–20.
[104] *ibid*., 119.

much residence abroad during the formative period"—confesses weakly that he "really [doesn't] know." His only real interest is in an English style of aristocratic politics, a "gentleman's game" accompanied by "a delightful country life" with "fox-hunting and house parties and all that." It is with this image in mind that he speaks idly of seeking a commission in the army or, failing that, "try[ing] diplomacy." In doing so, he infuriates Miss Middleton, who, in seeking to dispel her suitor's illusions about the foreign service lifestyle, becomes a mouthpiece for Wilson's own political views:

> American diplomacy is not gold lace and champagne. It's hard work for patriotic men with brains . . . . Now, if you've got brains and patriotism, get into the game and use them for your country. . . . Oh, the privilege of being a young American with enough to live on and a surplus to spend for the good of his country! If I were such a one . . . I'd feel that I *owed* the rest of my money and *all* my mind, my courage, and my energy, to my country. What is the matter with young men like you? Don't you see what chances of usefulness, what fine careers, you are throwing away? And you sit around futile and gently bored—or else you work for money that you neither desire nor need! Get into the game. Organize boy scouts, improve agriculture, run decent newspapers, take off your kid gloves and go into ward politics. *Do* something. *Be* something. This is *your* country. Help run it. Improve it! Serve it. Repay the fortunes it has given you.

"The trouble," Miss Middleton concludes sadly, "is people like you all want to be ambassadors or glorified advocates of peace." Charles seems "too refined" for the real, hard work of "unsterilized politics."[105] The reference to sterility is almost certainly euphemistic. Unlike Drake, whose passion and manly courage impress Miss Middleton, the "vapid," weak-willed "Charley" barely registers as a man. Other characters seem to share this opinion. Forced to introduce Charles at a party, Captain Hawk pointedly avoids using male pronouns: "[W]e had to bring *it* along," he explains to the other guests, "or *it*

[105] *ibid*., 114–16.

would not let Miss Middleton come." On hearing Hawk's veiled insult, Charles "looks foolish"—and Miss Middleton "looks bored."[106]

"Charley" Barney thus serves as a powerful foil to the manly, all-American heroism of the professional policymakers. Ditto Mr. Caro, a foreign-born anarchist who embodies the dangers of unassimilated immigration. In stark contrast to Drake and especially to Captain Hawk, Caro has little sense of patriotism or civic duty:

CAPTAIN HAWK

Are you an American?

MR. CARO

(*In a foreign accent*) Soon I get my first papers (*shrugging his shoulders*) but you know I am a citizen of the world.

CAPTAIN HAWK

Did you have to do military service before you came over here?

MR. CARO

No, I escaped that tyranny. I belong to the great army of common humanity (*rhetorically*) which knows no country.[107]

Caro is also of somewhat ambiguous gender identity. Wilson goes out of his way to emphasize the sensual aspects of his appearance, endowing him with "large and handsome dark eyes" and "a large and sensuous mouth," stuffing his body into a tight

[106] *ibid*., 66.
[107] *ibid*., 67–68.

frock coat "with a very low collar," placing a "flowing tie of soft material" around his neck, and giving him a cat to stroke.[108]

Physically unthreatening, Caro is nevertheless an insidious provocateur, full of divisive ideas which set the professional policymakers on edge. It is in response to one of these—the interests of workers are, according to Caro, "world-wide, not country-wide"—that Captain Hawk begins to wax lyrical about the "great American family." When Caro protests—"But your Irish-Americans want one thing. Your American Catholics stand together—and your Methodists and so on"—Hawk delivers a more forceful reply:

> We must not work as members of a sect or a race or a group for its own separate interests. We must all be Americans—first, last and all the time. I'm for every good American whatever his race or creed. I'm against (s*triking his hand on the table*) American Jews, for example,—though I'm willing to fight and die for Jewish Americans. What I demand is (*loudly*) our country first. . . . Of course I am against you, Mr. Caro; you're too broad-minded for me. If you people want to regulate a country go back and begin on your own. You'll find when the time comes that there are a few old-fashioned Americans left and that they propose to regulate their own country in their own way.

"Oh, you only hold these views because you are a capitalist and an aristocrat, Captain Hawk" replies Caro with a smile. This is too much for the Captain to bear. "Rising somewhat angrily," he returns fire—and in so doing articulates a powerful defense of meritocracy:

> In the true Greek meaning "aristocracy" means power in the hands of the best; "kakistocracy" means power in the hands of the worst. Representative democracy, by the grace of God, will sometime mean spirit in the heart and brain of the sovereign people to exert their power to govern themselves through their chosen best representatives—true aristocrats in fact. So you see true democracy and true aristocracy are the same thing. Who is the aristocrat—who is the best man? It's a

[108] *ibid*., 61.

> question of fact. . . . Why you could almost have a mathematical scale of honesty, sincerity, wisdom and unselfishness to measure men by.

By contrast, the content of Caro's ideology amounts to little more than "a rotten aristocracy, a diseased caste idea, this rot about aristocrats and commoners, and 'the peepul' and the 'plain people.' We're all Americans, aren't we, with equal rights?"[109]

Does Captain Hawk's xenophobic nationalism really present a viable alternative to the politics of social division? In the world of *Stultitia*, it does. Over the course of his debate with Caro, Hawk wins the support of an unlikely ally: Dan Riley, the working-class son of the War Department's Irish-American charwoman. Initially a supporter the labor movement, Dan, ambitious and upwardly mobile, changes his tune after listening to the Captain's impassioned calls for national unity. "This is the real highbrow dope," he tells his mother with glee. "Captain Hawk's right. If the foreigners don't like it they can go home. I'm not going to let [socialists] divide up the tidy little business I'm soon starting, and I'm always telling [the head of the labor movement] not to push the capitalist too hard because I hope to be one myself some day."[110]

Dan's political realignment plays only a minor role in *Stultitia*. As a symbol, however, its significance is profound. Confronted by a sinister, unmanly, un-American outsider, Captain Hawk, an elite professional policymaker who is proud to call himself an "aristocrat," is able to make common cause with a blue-collar working man by proving

[109] *ibid*., 77–81.
[110] *ibid*., 82–83.

his mettle in the political arena. Wilson's vindication is complete: the "gold lace" public servant has rolled up his sleeves to become one with the common folk.

PART THREE. THE SECOND NIGHTMARE

3.1. "A Breath of Fresh Air"?

On 11 February 1910, as yet another appropriations bill was working its way through Congress, Representative Francis Burton Harrison decided once again to lay out his views on the state of the American diplomacy. For the most part, Harrison was unimpressed. Secretary of State Knox struck him as a well-intentioned fool whose policies had an unfortunate tendency to backfire. Then, the Representative from New York turned his attention to the diplomatic service, repeating some of the claims he had made two years earlier. "Today," complained Harrison, "ambassadors are too often messenger boys in silk knee breeches, with toy swords, who spend their whole time either being photographed as the hosts of royalty or chanting the monotonous and sometimes nauseating song of 'Hands Across the Sea,'" a popular march celebrating the maintenance of friendly relations with foreign governments. Because no "real, active, virile man," no "substantial and responsible" American, would ever deign to carry out such humiliating duties, the State Department had been forced to fill its legations with bloated geriatrics, "loaded down with honors in the evening of life" and so content to "pass [their] declining years in the best society of Europe."[111]

It was a familiar list of charges. Champ Clark and James Mann surely would have recognized them and nodded in agreement; so, too, would Peter Finley Dunne and Mr. Dooley. But at this point, Harrison changed his footing. "I see," he continued, "that into

[111] *Cong. Rec.* 45 (1910), 1795.

this atmosphere of stagnation and decay there has come a breath of fresh air for which Secretary Knox appears to be responsible." Its source was "dollar diplomacy," which had tethered the "value" of American foreign service personnel to "the cash amount of trade which they can bring into American business coffers."[112] Harrison's claims echoed similar ones which had appeared earlier that day on the front page of the Washington *Post*. "TO PROD DIPLOMATS," the headline had screamed, "Knox Will Urge Greater Commercial Activity. BELIEVES MANY ARE LAX." The following article had made the same points in greater detail: Knox, eager to ensure that his Department was pressing "with all vigor" in support of American commerce, was "preparing to destroy certain ornamental characteristics of several American diplomatic jobs" by rebuking diplomats who had "luxuriated" at their posts. The new initiative was modeled in part on the existing system of consular inspection, which was helping the Secretary of State determine which of his consuls needed a "prod"—"If it has become apparent that Mr. Consul has been too busy playing bridge and attending garden parties to step among the foreign merchants and find out how business is going, he is likely to receive a letter in which there is a real sting." Now, thanks to Knox and his dollar diplomacy, Mr. Ambassador and his subordinates were going to feel the "sting," too. At least, that was what the *Post* anticipated:

> In the natural march of events, . . . Americans of high diplomatic rank are being looked over with a critical eye. Those who have possibly acquired the idea that they have been placed in the foreign capitals simply to be looked at and to transmit diplomatic notes to reigning sovereigns are to be given an awakening and

[112] *ibid*.

> reminded that one of the main functions of the American State Department is the maintenance of commercial relations abroad.[113]

All of this seems to have made a deep impression on Harrison, and on the floor of the House, he, too, sang the new policy's praises:

> [D]ollar diplomacy, no doubt, will cause a thrill of horror in the minds of those of our ambassadors abroad who spend their days entirely in the society of aristocrats where the mere mention of trade is vulgar. To those of our foreign representatives whose evenings are spent "galling the kibe of the courtiers," a shudder of dismay will proceed upon the adoption of the new dollar diplomacy, but to every American citizen who has traveled abroad and who values at its present worth the American diplomatic service, it will come as a matter of rejoicing that at last some real work is to be given to American diplomats, so that they may earn the respect and regard of their contemporaries and the salaries which we are now called upon to vote them. [Applause.][114]

For a moment, it looked like Knox and his much-maligned agents had snatched a stunning victory from the jaws of defeat. But Harrison's dramatic about-face, and the "applause" it inspired, did not end the debate. A few minutes later, the Representative from New York was on his feet again, this time in order to *criticize* dollar diplomacy as a corrupt instrument of Wall Street. Members of the "money trust," he claimed, was collaborating with Knox and his colleagues in financial ventures from which other bankers had been excluded. A second New Yorker, John Fitzgerald, repeated and expanded the charge: the State Department, "apparently by the means of a carefully concealed strong arm," seemed to be diverting money "into the pockets of certain favored individuals in this country upon the theory that a beneficent extension of trade between this and other countries was taking place."[115]

---

[113] Arthur C. Johnson, "To Prod Diplomats," Washington *Post*, 11 February 1910, 1.
[114] *Cong. Rec.* 45 (1910), 1795.
[115] *ibid*., 1801.

Over the course of the next two years, the relationship between American foreign policy and American capital would come under intense and sometimes debilitating public scrutiny. This naturally concerned Huntington Wilson, who in his new role as First Assistant Secretary of State emerged as an important supporter of state-guided international commerce and finance.[116] Yet in Wilson's mind, dissent and criticism registered not merely as obstacles to dollar diplomacy but also as signs of social indiscipline. Wherever the Assistant Secretary looked, he saw far less patriotic unity, and far more selfish discord, than seemed healthy.

3.2. Dollar Diplomacy and Its Discontents

3.2.1. TRADE PROMOTION AND "CHOSEN INSTRUMENTS"

The term "dollar diplomacy" came to be associated with two separate but related modes of activity sponsored by the Taft Administration. The first involved action to protect and promote American *trade*—this was the policy Representative Harrison had praised for breathing life back into the foreign service. In a way, he was right. Since the 1890s, supporters of the professionalization movement both inside and outside the State Department had indeed adopted the promotion of international commerce as their principal *raison d'être*. Many reformist Department officials conceived of the new administrative machinery they had set out to build as a tool for consolidating and improving American access to foreign markets.[117] In doing so, they aligned themselves

[116] On public opposition to dollar diplomacy and Huntington Wilson's involvement in the policy's articulation, see Jer[ry] Israel, *Progressivism and the Open Door: America and China, 1905–1921* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1971).
[117] This is one of the central theses advanced in Werking, *Master Architects*.

intellectually with private-sector efficiency activists who sought state support for their efforts to improve the international competitiveness of American industry. The activists held that scientific management and the creation of export-oriented commercial monopolies would help sustain American economic growth in an age when disciplined, highly organized societies seemed to be ascendant.[118] It was the familiar logic of "social Taylorism," this time appearing in its natural habitat.

Huntington Wilson moved easily within this milieu. For one thing, as noted at the beginning of this paper, the efficiency-oriented "organizational" impulse already occupied a cardinal position within Wilson's "cognitive map." Moreover, opening up new markets for American goods struck him as an important service to the nation: it would "benefit . . . not any particular section but the whole country, and will increase the prosperity alike of the merchant, the manufacturer, the agriculturalist, the capitalist, and consequently that of the operative and of labor generally."[119] However, the logic of social Taylorism and corporate nationalism imposed extra obligations on the business community even as it sealed its alliance with the State Department. "The most expert nations in foreign commerce," the Assistant Secretary explained to the Pan American Commercial Congress in 1911, "are organized so that the whole economic fabric . . . is linked up with the proper departments of the government": in each, "the whole economic energy of the country presents an undivided front in the foreign field—and that," he

---

[118] Burton I. Kaufmann, "The Organizational Dimension of United States Economic Foreign Policy, 1900–1920," *Business History Review* 46/1 (1972): 17–44.

[119] Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson, "Memorandum Regarding a Commercial Appropriation for the State Department," 22 July 1909, *HWP*. Digital copy: https://digitalcommons.ursinus.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=fmhw_organization

warned, "is what the United States will have to meet." To do so, Americans would have to "take a leaf out of the book of the advanced nations" by shedding their "hopeless" and "exaggerated individualism," which had "no place in promoting the foreign trade in a patriotic and scientific manner."[120]

Wilson was equally interested in a second variety of dollar diplomacy: the use of American *foreign investment* as a "chosen instrument" for projecting power on the international stage. Private capital could serve the state in a variety of ways; its value was more than purely economic. In the circum-Caribbean, for example, the State Department sought to use American banks and financial advisors, backed by treaties and (when necessary) armed force, as tools for imposing political, economic, and financial discipline upon countries considered too irresponsible to manage their own affairs. Doing so, argued Wilson and his colleagues, establish American control over the region's markets. But it would also "uplift" its backward societies, bring them peace and prosperity, and in so doing protect them—and their American neighbors—from European meddling. Here, investment, trade, and geopolitics went hand in hand.[121]

---

[120] "Address of Hon. Huntington Wilson, Assistant Secretary of State, at the Pan-American Commercial Conference," Washington, 15 February 1911, *HWP*.

[121] The "chosen instrument" variety of dollar diplomacy has received a great deal of scholarly attention. The best treatments may be found in Emily S. Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890–1945* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996 [1982]); and *ibid*., *Financial Missionaries to the World: The Politics and Culture of Dollar Diplomacy* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003), esp. 31–96. For Wilson's views on dollar diplomacy and the Taft Administration's Caribbean policies, see Eppinga, "Aristocrat, Nationalist, Diplomat," 139–227; Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson, "Notes on Dollar Diplomacy and the Monroe Doctrine," *HWP*; and *ibid*., "confidential" memorandum on the State of the Union, "possibly 1913," Folder 4, Doc. 5, *HWP*. An online copy of "Notes on Dollar Diplomacy and the Monroe Doctrine" is available here: https://digitalcommons.ursinus.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=fmhw_speeches

It is all too easy to think of this second kind of dollar diplomacy as simply an extension of the first with more ambitious goals. This was not Wilson's view. As far as the Assistant Secretary of State was concerned, trade promotion and foreign investment were fundamentally different operations. Facilitating the spread of American goods around the world was an end in itself, yielding benefits for all Americans. By contrast, loaning money to foreign governments was only a *means* to achieve some *other* end. "There are cases," wrote Wilson to President William Howard Taft in 1910, "where *political or commercial considerations* make an American investment in the foreign field *an indispensable instrument* for advancing the national interest." But investment *per se* meant nothing to the State Department "because *in itself* it may contribute little or nothing to American interest[s] generally."[122] There could be no question, then, of extending Departmental support indiscriminately, for the sole purpose of helping private financiers make money. Doing so might, in certain cases, actually *undermine* the national interest. As Wilson explained to the readers of the *Saturday Evening Post* in 1912:

> [S]ince the interest of this government can only be the extension of American commerce, . . . the amelioration of political conditions upon which commerce, progress, and civilization depend, and the furtherance of American prestige, the advantage of which is commercial as well as moral, it is impossible that the Department of State would support bankers' enterprises of the kind which, to be particularly profitable, must be particularly onerous.[123]

Wilson was not opposed to letting financiers benefit directly from participation in state-supported ventures. In fact, he expected them to do so. The "chosen instrument"

---

[122] Wilson to Taft, 22 February 1910, *HWP*. My italics. Digital copy: https://digitalcommons.ursinus.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1010&context=fmhw_organization.
[123] [Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson], "Our 'Dollar Diplomacy' and Secretary Knox," *Saturday Evening Post*, "1912" [handwritten note in margin], *HWP*.

mode of dollar diplomacy was no cash cow—"Indeed, the wonder is that our bankers are willing to go as far afield and undertake such difficult negotiations for ordinary profits when their own country affords so much easier business"—but it did confer a certain amount of prestige upon its participants. Wilson hoped to see this reward passed on to as many people as possible, supposing that bankers, like exporters, might organize themselves into "a single front, like a wedge, in the foreign field."[124] However, dividing the spoils was ultimately of secondary importance only. Pursuing the national interest came first—and crucially, doing so tended to involve engaging in financial projects so large and risky that, in Wilson's opinion, only the biggest, wealthiest, and most ambitious investors were adequately prepared to handle their challenges. "One would hardly ask a man having only ten million dollars to lend that sum to a country forty years in arrears and the prey of revolutionaries," Wilson argued in defense of his Department's collaboration with Wall Street banks. "One would go to the banker with the greatest capital, for he alone would be willing to risk such a sum in such an uninviting investment, because he alone could afford it and would be tempted by the attraction of international banking and governmental cooperation."[125]

This sort of attitude was bound to irritate any "man having only ten million dollars" who, forced to look at dollar diplomacy from an outsider's vantage point, still saw it as a way of making money rather than a means for scoring brownie points or pledging allegiance to the flag. In fact, Wilson came to suspect that the public outcry

[124] *ibid*.; Wilson to Taft, 22 February 1910.
[125] Memorandum on "Honduras and Nicaragua Loan Conventions," Folder 8, Doc. 17, *HWP*.

against the Taft Administration's foreign investment policies was emerging, at least in part, from within the world of high finance and big business. In late February 1910, shortly after Representatives Harrison and Fitzgerald had launched their attacks on dollar diplomacy and the "money trust," the Assistant Secretary reported to President Taft that several malcontent bankers and investors were trying to bludgeon the government into subsidizing their overseas dealings by spreading "systematic propaganda" through the press. The propagandists all charged the State Department with "injustice" and "partiality to one set of bankers as against another." Hence the "misstatement, misunderstanding, [and] innuendo" flowing from the pens of journalists who, in Wilson's opinion, should have known better. Hence, too, the allegations that Harrison and Fitzgerald had repeated to Congress: "Such propaganda even cropped out . . . in remarks recently made by a Member of the House of Representatives."[126]

Wilson was horrified. His discovery seemed to suggest that the dollar diplomacy controversy was, at least in part, a symptom of a corrosive, selfish, antistate brand of individualism he feared intensely. "One would expect," he wrote gloomily to Taft, "to find among our bankers and business men a degree of patriotism, of mutual consideration, and of skilful [*sic*] combination, which would allow them to cooperate abroad instead of allowing the play of petty jealousies to destroy their effectiveness in foreign enterprise." But the petty jealousies had triumphed—and it was not just banking and business which suffered:

[126] Wilson to Taft, 22 February 1910.

> In the present situation, it seems that if the Department of State, for broad political and commercial reasons, seeks a financial instrumentality to promote some phase of our foreign policy, the result is that the syndicate which undertakes the work feels that it is, for reasons of patriotism, doing a thankless and relatively unprofitable task, while other individuals or syndicates, whether or not they would have the power to do [the work of dollar diplomacy] themselves, raise the cry of favoritism, as if the government were giving a gold mine to the syndicate concerned merely from an amiable desire to enrich it.[127]

In other words, the financial elite's inability to distinguish between ends and means, between patriotism and money-lust, was threatening to hamstrung American foreign policy. Far from combining to serve their country, bankers and industrialists appeared to be sewing discord and undermining the state.

3.2.2. The Press, Pressure Groups, and Public Opinion

Wilson did not blame the press campaigns that were undermining his dollar diplomacy on "propagandists" alone. Newspapers were at fault, too. The Assistant Secretary professed himself willing to tolerate what he regarded as sincere and reasonable journalistic critiques of American foreign policy. But some writers pressed beyond what was acceptable. Wilson treated their work as a manifestation of one or more social diseases.

The first was greed. Speaking before the Third National Peace Conference in 1911, the Assistant Secretary went out of his way to condemn newspapers which, in his view, had sensationalized American foreign policy for "purely commercial purposes." Anyone who printed "penny dreadfuls," he suggested, "should be suppressed, like the

[127] *ibid*.

purveyor of injurious drugs."[128] Equally damaging to the national interest were partisan attacks upon American foreign policy. These hinted at the depth of a second signs of a second social disease: political polarization. "In the United States, perhaps less than any other country, is there reason why foreign policy should be a party issue," Wilson observed to President Taft. "The aims and functions of our diplomacy are pre-eminently for the equal good for all parts of the country and all sections of the public." Nevertheless, wrote Wilson to Taft, "[s]ome of our newspapers, for party reasons, think fit to attack the foreign policy of your administration as systematically as they do any other of its processes." Initially, such comments, so obviously backed by "animus" and bias, struck Wilson as relatively harmless.[129] But by 1911, the Assistant Secretary had begun to worry about the impact of politically-charged criticism on his government's prestige abroad. Partisan newspapers, Wilson warned the Third National Peace Congress, ought to recognize that

> indiscriminately to embarrass the diplomacy of the country through frivolous misrepresentation or malicious attack is not to assail any administration, but to attack the country itself among the nations of the world—something for which there is an ugly name, and as to which there should be something beyond the present statute.[130]

Towards the end of 1911, an indirect threat to dollar diplomacy brought a third social disease to light: the supposedly insidious influence of what Wilson called "pressure groups," which sought to exercise political power through organized press campaigns.

---

[128] "Address of the Hon. Huntington Wilson, Assistant Secretary of State, at the Third National Peace Congress," Baltimore, 4 May 1911, *HWP*.
[129] *ibid*.
[130] "Address . . . at the Third National Peace Congress."

"'Labor,' 'Capital,' 'German-Americans,' 'Italian-Americans,' 'High Finance,' 'Industry,'—indeed," Wilson believed, "every interest, 'vested' or not, was capable of being, at times, a pressure group."[131] And for years, one such group, the American Jewish Committee, had sought to modify American foreign policy. Horrified by the Russian government's increasingly virulent anti-Semitism and offended by its refusal to grant visas to American Jews, the Committee demanded that the Taft Administration abrogate a long-standing Russo-American commercial treaty. State Department officials favored remaining on friendly terms with the Russians, whom they were trying to draw into an international financial consortium responsible for extending dollar diplomacy to China. But in December 1911, the Jewish Committee forced the Department's hand, steering an abrogation bill through the House of Representatives and placing it before an obviously sympathetic Senate.[132]

Wilson was furious. "Hoped-for cooperation with Russia, in the China Consortium . . . , touched a great policy"—dollar diplomacy—"that affected the interests of all Americans." Now, Congress was threatening to denounce the treaty "in the most impolite possible way." Quick action by the State Department was able to soften the blow, thereby preventing "further affront to Russia to the serious detriment of American interests in the Far East." Even so, the Jewish Committee's apparent power made Wilson uneasy. The whole crisis, he later complained, "had arisen through resentment, on the

---

[131] Wilson, *Memoirs*, 234.

[132] On the American Jewish Committee's abrogation campaign, see Naomi W. Cohen, "The Abrogation of the Russo-American Treaty of 1832," *Jewish Social Studies* 25/1 (1963): 3–41; on the State Department's position, Clifford L. Egan, "Pressure Groups, the Department of State, and the Abrogation of the Russo-American Treaty of 1832," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 115/4 (1971): 328–34.

part of Americans of Jewish lineage, of past wrongs done their race in Russia." The fact that its immediate causes had included the visa issue, which Wilson considered trivial, only made things worse:

> Although I could sympathize with every real grievance of American citizens of Jewish or any other origin, I was shocked to see how an energetic minority, perhaps not even truly representative of the wisest and best of their own section of our population, could, through pressure on the press, attempt to sweep aside national policy in favor of fancied self-interest.[133]

A fourth disease—less treacherous, but more profound, than greed, partisan bickering, or pressure group "self-interest"—was ignorance. As scandal followed scandal, Wilson was forced to acknowledge that his countrymen were only just beginning to understand the importance of national unity and the responsibilities of world power. Time would bring improvement.[134] But the going was slow. Even after he had left the State Department, Wilson was still complaining that "Americans, unlike any other people, are prone . . . to decry, on scant information, the acts of their own government while accepting without criticism the views and acts of foreign governments, even when in conflict with their own country. This tendency," he added hastily, "will doubtless disappear with the growth of a more vigorous national self-consciousness."[135] Yet consciousness-building was the product of long experience. This was certainly true as far

---

[133] Wilson, *Memoirs*, 233–34.

[134] Despite his ferocious attacks on journalists during the Third National Peace Congress, Wilson still maintained that "the American press, as a whole, [was] already beginning to respond to its patriotic and moral obligations so increased since the United States entered on its destined position as a great world power." Note, however, the Assistant Secretary's use of the word "beginning." This, along with the critique that preceded it, suggests that Wilson did not believe the end to be close at hand. *ibid*.

[135] Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson, review of Hiram Bingham, *The Monroe Doctrine: An Obsolete Shibboleth* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1913), *Yale Review* (January 1914), *HWP*.

as the press was concerned. In "older countries, where foreign relations have always been a matter of vital interest," journalists recognized that they had a duty to support the policies of their governments. By contrast, "the scholarly, painstaking and patriotic discussion of foreign affairs is a task new to a large section of our press. . . . This newness of the task," Wilson concluded in February 1910, "doubtless accounts for much un-informed and ill considered [*sic*] comment."[136]

Why were citizens of "older" powers so much more orderly that Americans in their analysis of foreign affairs? The answer seemed obvious to Wilson. "It is quite natural," he explained to the Third National Peace Congress,

> that in countries where dangerous frontiers and other weaknesses make a fight for national existence a familiar possibility to the people, foreign relations should be of vital interest. In such countries the man in the street takes shrewd interest in his country's foreign relations. Much space is given to them in the press. To write of them is familiar and they are a reality. *With us it is less so*, and consequently when a certain section of the press gives rein to its imagination our public, *less compelled to a vital interest*, is the more easily misled.[137]

Vulnerability instilled discipline and fostered mutual understanding, while security begat apathy and impressionability: it was a tidy, Darwinian argument—and its implications were profoundly disturbing. For Wilson, anything which delayed the crystallization of an American national consciousness also hindered the State Department's ability to project power and safeguard American interests from foreign threats. But it now appeared that the absence of obvious threats was itself undermining national unity, thus becoming a kind of weakness. Such was the fundamental paradox of

---

[136] Wilson to Taft, 22 February 1910.

[137] "Address . . . to the Third National Peace Congress." My italics.

social evolutionary thinking. Just months before the outbreak of the First World War, Wilson rammed the point home: "In Europe there is an interest in the foreign relations of the Great Powers because there is felt to be in them menacing danger to the subject or citizen. It is to be hoped that this nation may become interested and informed otherwise than through blundering into a painful experience!"[138]

3.2.3. WILSON'S RESIGNATION

Disputes between bankers and bad press coverage unsettled Huntington Wilson's mind. Political change in Washington ended his career. The chain of events which guided his departure from the State Department began with the triumph of Woodrow Wilson, a Democrat, in the Presidential Election of November 1912. It ended five months later when, on 18 March 1913, the freshly-inaugurated President publicly withdrew American support from an international financial consortium through which the Taft Administration had tried to extend its dollar diplomacy to China. The Assistant Secretary had by then already decided to leave the service; he had delayed doing so only because the new Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, was having trouble finding someone to fill his position. But initially, he seems to have been inclined to go stoically, without comment. The sudden change in policy—a change which Huntington Wilson, to his horror, learned of via a newspaper report rather than through official channels—ruled out

[138] Wilson, review of Bingham.

that option.[139] Framed by the controversies of the previous three years, the President's actions appeared positively un-American.

At first, Huntington seems to have hoped that the professional foreign service might win over Woodrow and his allies. Sometime before 4 March, when the Wilson Administration assumed office, the Assistant Secretary composed a long memorandum urging its officials to endorse the policies he had championed for so long. Foreign service reform had produced an organization "so excellent . . . that a new Secretary of State and Assistant Secretary of State, if they be sensible men, willing to listen to reason and facts, will find every opportunity to keep on the track." Dollar diplomacy, which Wilson defined as "intelligent teamwork," also had to seem appealing "[i]f this government has high purposes in its diplomacy—the promotion of peace and prosperity, intelligent regard of its political and strategic interests and wise forethought for the uncertain potentialities of the future and a practical wish to promote its commerce." Staying the course was self-evidently the wise choice. Deviation, by contrast, promised to bring political and strategic ruin. The danger was greatest in the circum-Caribbean, where dollar diplomacy was enacting the Monroe Doctrine's Roosevelt Corollary and protecting the Panama Canal. Wilson depicted the consequences of financial withdrawal from the Caribbean in nightmarish terms:

---

[139] Francis Mairs Huntington Wilson, *Memoirs of an Ex-Diplomat*, 245–50; Eppinga, "Aristocrat, Nationalist, Diplomat," 291–99.

Wilson wrote two letters of resignation to the President. The furious second letter, described below, activated the first, which he submitted preemptively on 4 March. The first, "[r]espectfully submitted," simply reads: "I have the honor to place in your hands my resignation as the Assistant Secretary of State." Huntington Wilson to Woodrow Wilson, 4 March 1913. Digital copy: https://digitalcommons.ursinus.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1243&context=fmhw_other.

> Rotten little countries [in Central America] run heavily into debt to Europe. They wont [*sic*] pay. Europe comes along and demands payment. The United States must either let Europe land marines and hold customs houses for security, and so open the way for further penetration and flagrant violation of the Monroe Doctrine, or else the United States must compel the little republics to be decent and pay up.

Previously, the United States had used targeted foreign investment pursue the second option. Would it continue to do so after 4 March 1913? Already, warned Wilson, villainous revolutionaries were preparing to rise up, and American bankers to retreat, all over the circum-Caribbean in anticipation of an abrupt reversal of course in Washington. It was therefore vital to "the dignity and interests of the entire nation" that the new President affirm, preferably in his inaugural address, the "continuity of American foreign policy" before the eyes of the world.[140]

No such language appeared in the President's speech. However, Wilson did receive what he interpreted as a positive signal from the incoming administration. On 4 March, he called on Bryan, offering to remain at his post until the Secretary of State had recruited a new deputy. Bryan received his proposal warmly—so warmly, it seems, that Wilson believed he was being *asked* to stay, and that the Administration would thereafter defer to his wishes. "When I *consented*, at the *request* of Mr. Bryan and *in deference to what I understood to be your wishes*," he would later inform the President, "I believe I was justified in assuming that there would be no radical departure from the practice and experience of this and other countries whereby the knowledge and experience of the

[140] Memorandum on the State of the Union address, "possibly 1913" (archivist's note), Folder 4, Doc. 5, *HWP*.

various officials of the foreign service is made use of in the study of the great questions of foreign policy."[141]

It was a fatal misunderstanding. When, two weeks later, the new administration modified its predecessor's Chinese policy, Wilson expressed shock and outrage. He left the State Department immediately, submitting a scorching letter of resignation to the President. Unsurprisingly, the letter vigorously defended foreign-investment dollar diplomacy *à la* Wilson—"[I]n the work of advancing our national interests . . . , the financial force of the United States should be marshalled in some manner to present a safely united front, where it would be like the apex of a triangle"—and denounced its abandonment, an act which "shows on its face the inadequacy of the consideration given to the facts and theories involved and the failure clearly to apprehend the motives leading to and the purposes of the policy superseded." But highlighting his superior political wisdom was not enough for Wilson; he also pointedly directed the President's attention to the upstanding character, the laudable impartiality, and above all the patriotism of foreign service officers:

> I beg leave to take the liberty of referring to the phrase in your inaugural address by which you summon "all honest men, all patriotic, all forward-looking men to your side" and of assuring you that when you apply to the Department of State for technical advice in formulating your policies you can nowhere find men more truly described by that phrase than the patriotic, intelligent, high-minded and non-partisan gentlemen, whose association I am leaving with such regret.[142]

---

[141] Huntington Wilson to Woodrow Wilson, 19 March 1913, Folder 7, Doc. 5, *HWP*. On the meeting with Bryan, see Wilson, *Memoirs*, 246.
[142] Huntington Wilson to Woodrow Wilson, 19 March 1913.

The professionals, then, were serving their country wisely and dutifully. Their actions and values could be fitted neatly into Wilson's vision of an ideal United States. The President, by contrast, was refusing to play by the rules; he did not seem to understand foreign policy or how to make it. Why? In a private note written on the day of his resignation, the Assistant Secretary made a revealing diagnosis: because the Election of 1912 had involved three major Presidential candidates, Woodrow Wilson had managed to score a victory without winning a majority of the popular vote. Thus, American policy, previously "worked out by administrations which ha[d] the mandate of the majority" and "evolved through years of study by patriotic, well-informed men," was being "destroyed by an administration elected by a minority."[143]

What right had Huntington Wilson, an unelected bureaucrat, to question the President's mandate, to scoff at his foreign policy? The answer was simple: "I speak as a *plain citizen* who has studied the subject during about sixteen years of service, not as a partisan."[144] Here, in a nutshell, was the ideology of foreign service reform. The Assistant Secretary of State was a "plain" American; he served the country, and so could speak for the nation. Woodrow Wilson, representative of the "minority," did neither.

3.3. *Stultitia* as Autobiography

It was against this backdrop that, in early 1913, Wilson wrote *Stultitia*—and it is against this backdrop that the play's plot must be interpreted. At its heart stand various

[143] Note on American "Far Eastern policy," Folder 13, Doc. 4, *HWP*.
[144] *ibid*.

policies that either constitute or are related to dollar diplomacy: an Army reform bill, a naval construction bill, a bill authorizing the construction of a railroad to Panama, and a convention providing security for a loan to the fictitious Caribbean Republic of Colonia. Drake, Hawk, General Middleton, and the staff of the Navy Department all support the defense bills. Steering them through Congress, however, forces the professionals to deal with powerful and unsavory opponents, each embodying a different strain of the divisive political parochialism Wilson believed he had been fighting for years.

In the House of Representatives, the fate of the bills rests in the hands of Representative Karl Shuffler, a hackish machine politician who chairs the "Party Caucus." Hawk privately despises Shuffler as "one of our very most poisonous 'little Americans,'" a man "for no battleships, no army, [and] no diplomacy" whose preferred foreign policy is "[a] chip on each shoulder and both arms in a sling."[145] General Middleton, however, is initially keen on forging an alliance with him, inviting him to the War Department and appealing to his sense of patriotic duty. The problem, as Drake later outs it, is that Shuffler "hasn't an idea above ward politics," a limitation which quickly makes a mockery out of the professionals' attempt to broach the subject of national defense.[146] "I know that you realize as well as I do," the General begins, "that [the Army and Navy bills] are of vital interest to all the men and women of our country and that upon them depends our safety and the safety of our children and our children's children. . . . I know that you who are the leaders of Congress feel the terrible responsibility of

[145] Wilson, *Stultitia*, 19–20.
[146] *ibid*., 101.

guarding the nation's safety." Shuffler responds to this gracious overture by fidgeting and checking his watch. "It's 9:30, General," he clucks reproachfully. "[A]t 10 I have a very important appointment to see the President, in relation to a matter of grave moment to the interests of the party in my State." To add insult to injury, the "matter of grave moment" turns out to be outrageously mundane: "Yes, I've got to see the President about the appointment of that collector of internal revenue in my home town."[147]

Shuffler's indifference is bad enough—both Hawk and General Middleton curse the Congressman in their sleep.[148] But the situation is much worse in the Senate, where outright opponents of the defense bills control the Foreign Relations, Military Affairs, and Naval Affairs Committees. One of the most persistent troublemakers is Senator Rock, an industrialist and "extreme individualist" who "thinks the sole function of government is to protect capital from being robbed by labor."[149] As might be expected, Rock's antipathy to reform is entirely self-interested. Reorganizing the Army will involve establishing new military canteens, a measure opposed by private distillers in Rock's home state; it will also require the abolition of small military garrisons, which provide employment to several thousand of the state's residents.[150] The Navy's plan to build a fleet of large, modern battleships looks to be equally bad for business. "These dreadnoughts don't half fit our navyyards," the Senator complains. "Why lots of our constituents are kicking because no money comes to their localities any more." To keep

147 *ibid*., 23–25.
148 *ibid*., 15, 20.
149 *ibid*., 26, 73.
150 *ibid*., 32–34, 38.

his state's shipyards in business, Rock demands that the Navy build smaller ships instead, silencing its objections with an ominous threat: "You'll take the little ones or none at all."[151] But the final nail in the coffin comes when the President, who favors state regulation of private enterprise, throws his weight behind the professionals. "[C]an't you turn the tide in favor of those national defense bills and get the treaties ratified?" he asks Senator Rock. "You know the safety of the country demands this." In response, the Senator, "[f]laring up somewhat," lets class politics get the better of him. "The safety of the country," he sniffs, "demands less interference with capital and more restraint of this labor movement. Your sympathy is largely responsible for these absurd pretensions of labor. You need ask no favors of me." Furious, the President reminds Senator Rock that he opposes both labor *and* capital. "You're both blindly, brutally selfish," he cries in frustration. "We're getting too much money and not enough happiness in this country." But the Senator is only interested in revenge. "I'll get even with *him*," he vows as he walks away.[152]

Even more dangerous than Rock is his colleague Dormant, an ultraconservative Southern agrarian who (according to Drake) "thinks Jefferson's still President" and "hasn't had a new idea since."[153] Consequently, he stands rigidly opposed to "militarism" and diplomatic "entanglement" in Latin America—but in accordance with tradition, he *also* demands that the Monroe Doctrine be maintained and enforced "up to the hilt."[154]

---

[151] *ibid*., 48–49.
[152] *ibid*., 108–09.
[153] *ibid*., 101.
[154] *ibid*., 39–41.

With help from Admiral Stevens, a naval intelligence officer, Drake sketches for Dormant—just as Huntington Wilson had for Woodrow Wilson—a nightmare scenario designed to illustrate the dangers inherent in the Senator's position: "A Caribbean republic runs into debt and won't listen to reason. We won't let Europe seize a port and force payment. Oh, no, Monroe Doctrine!" The easiest way to defuse the resulting tensions would be to encourage "patriotic American bankers . . . to wipe out the European debt and put the republic on its feet." However, Senator Dormant's restrictions on American diplomacy would prevent the State Department from negotiating such a loan. "Some day," warns Admiral Stevens, "one of our European friends will get tired of this and sail in and seize a port." "Then Senator Dormant will ask us to enforce the Monroe Doctrine up to the hilt," Drake chimes in. But how can the professionals, having been deprived of a powerful military by the Senator and his allies, hope to fend off a challenge from Europe? Instead, Admiral Stevens predicts disaster: "Then the American people will have the pleasure of seeing our paltry little fleet of battleships sunk by a superior force. The Monroe Doctrine will die hard and the bones of the Navy will be its monument."[155]

In their battles with the Senators, Drake, Stevens and their colleagues emphasize and try to weaponize their expertise. "We beg you to consider the facts and answer our arguments, if you can, with reason," an exasperated General Middleton explains to Senator Dormant. "[D]on't try to kill scientifically prepared plans for the national defense by quoting a dogma uttered by Washington or Jefferson."[156] Unfortunately, such

[155] *ibid*., 43–44.
[156] *ibid*., 31.

ostentatious displays of professionalism only seem to alienate Dormant and his colleagues. For Shuffler, a spoilsman *par excellence*, the very notion of meritocracy in government is anathema. "[T]he President is going too far with this business of disregarding politics in his appointments," he complains to General Middleton. "Civil Service is all very well for high-brow talk, but we've got to keep the [party] organization together."[157] Senator Rock, steeped in the logic of selfish individualism, treats Admiral Stevens' desire for more battleships as something natural, of little consequence—after all, "[e]very fellow's stuck on his own business."[158] Sectionalism and dogmatism, too, cast professional policymaking in a negative light. "[Y]ou bureaucrats are too far removed from the pulse of the plain people," complains the radical Western Senator Hyhead. Those "plain people" have little interest in naval defense measures—not, at least, "in my part of the country, a thousand miles from the sea coast." Nor do they appreciate "the disposition of the State Department to involve the United States with foreign countries, in order to enable Wall Street to lend them money at great profit."[159]

With Congress against them, what can Drake, Hawk, and their allies do to save the defense bills? At first, they try to exploit the most corrupt elements of the existing political order. Working through Dan Riley, who runs the political machine in charge of Representative Shuffler's congressional district, Drake and Hawk force the Chairman of the Party Caucus to steer the bills through the House and into the Senate.[160] Meanwhile,

---

[157] *ibid*., 24.
[158] *ibid*., 50.
[159] *ibid*., 40, 50.
[160] *ibid*., 17 –20, 83, 112.

the President quietly seeks extra help from two powerful private sources. One is Charles Barney's father, a department store magnate who controls the editorial pages of the many newspapers in which he advertises. The other, invited to join the cause in case the defense bills fail in the Senate, is Mr. Goldstein, a classical anti-Semite's caricature of a Jewish banker—Wilson has him speak with a ridiculous accent and saddles him with "rather heavy features of the Jewish type"—wealthy enough to finance both the Panama railroad and the loan to Colonia. Together, the two projects represent "[a] great chance for patriotic service. . . . They're cutting down the navy," the President explains, "and we've got to have a land route to defend the [Panama] Canal."[161]

Drake recognizes the necessity of turning to Barney Senior and Goldstein, but he also finds their vast influence profoundly unsettling. The papers under the former's control, with a combined circulation of four million, direct the thoughts of the ignorant masses—they create "that powerful and unanimous opinion of those who don't know the facts. . . . Didn't you know," Drake asks drily, "that bankers and department stores and other *active* organizations ruled us through the newspapers?" Referring to Goldstein, he continues: "That little old banker is the finger of destiny. I wonder what he will do?"[162]

Drake is right to wonder, for Goldstein quickly reveals himself to be one of *Stultitia*'s principal villains. The first sign of trouble comes courtesy of Barney Senior, whose pet newspaper editors balk at supporting the unpopular defense bills. "I couldn't press them," he confesses to Drake. "Goldstein and his friends are against it. Well, you

[161] *ibid*., 100, 104–05.
[162] *ibid*., 106.

see, my credit's in their hands. I'm patriotic, and all that, you know, but business is business. I don't know what's the matter with Goldstein."[163] "What's the matter" becomes clear almost immediately afterwards, when Drake catches sight of the banker engaging in secret negotiations with an ambassador from the court of "His Majesty," an unidentified but probably European monarch whose government has designs on Colonia. "A Yankee naval and diplomatic expansion just now would be very inopportune," the ambassador informs Goldstein. "Support these American plans, remember, and no more market for your securities on our bourse or with our allies." In exchange, the banker receives an ominous promise—"We'll let your house in on the financing of the war indemnity!"—and two additional offers of support, both of which gesture towards his European Jewish roots. "Your race is being persecuted still in our allies' country," the ambassador points out. "His Majesty's influence would be valuable. . . . And if you ever decide to go back [to your country of origin] and would like to be Baron Goldstein—maybe I can help you."[164]

The professionals and their allies treat Goldstein's treachery as conclusive proof that national unity is on the decline in the United States. Drake is clearly horrified by the proliferation and growing strength of dangerously "un-American" immigrants: "First, that fellow Caro, a near-American foreigner, interfering in our industrial and social affairs, and now this other American foreigner controlling our public opinion and interfering in

[163] *ibid*., 122–23.
[164] *ibid*., 124–25.

policies vital to the country." The President, by contrast, sees in Goldstein a reflection of selfishness and disharmony in Congress:

> I counted on Goldstein as an American. Perhaps I was wrong to expect it. Look at these native born Americans chosen by the nation. I can't even make them stand up together for the broad national interest. It's in the air. If we who are born here can't work together as one for the nation, what on earth can we expect of those we wish to assimilate?

Hawk, for his part, is ready to set a better example. "I'm for every true American, whatever his race or creed," he exclaims, "striking his hand on his sword . . . . [B]ut I'm against people who are American this or American that—though I'm willing to fight and die for any kind of *Americans*. The country first. That's the test."[165]

For the moment, though, there is little the professionals can do beyond offering themselves up as sacrificial victims. Even the exposure of Goldstein ultimately achieves nothing, as the papers will not print the allegations against him—"Do you think," the banker asks Drake, "they'd believe you, a mere bureaucrat?"[166] The defense bills fail to pass, "His Majesty" continues to scheme, and eventually, tensions in Colonia boil over into war. At that point, the grim prophecies of Drake and Admiral Stevens fulfill themselves. Vanquished in battle, the United States loses the Panama Canal and "everything else we had lying around loose";[167] it also loses Captain Hawk, who dies valiantly on the field of battle, a martyr—to what? "What do you want me to fight for?" Hawk asks General Middleton as he prepares to depart for the front.

---

[165] *ibid*., 129–31.
[166] *ibid*., 129.
[167] *ibid*., 171.

> Am I fighting for the half-baked immigrants . . . , for the Caros and the Goldsteins? Is it for the international bankers, or the big trusts, or the little trusts? Am I fighting for the people at Mrs. Barney's dinner, who draw nothing but their incomes from the sacred soil of our country? Am I fighting for Senator Hyhead, who snaps his fingers at the constitutional representative government of our forefathers? What on earth am I fighting for? For the selfishness of Senator Rock's capitalists or [his opponent's] labor organizations? Am I fighting for national incoherency, for a mob drunk with wealth, absorbed in money grubbing; for a lot of faddists who think in segments when great national questions are at issue? Am I fighting for somebody's re-election? My God, I'd like to know what I *am* fighting for![168]

The scene is a dark one, but there remains a glimmer of hope. "National incoherency" and military catastrophe kill Hawk. But his friends, who survive him, vow to honor his legacy by making the American nation whole. Doing so means taking action *outside* the existing political order; it also means reforming it from top to bottom. From the ashes of disaster, a new, corporate national community begins to rise, with professional policymakers standing at its head and backed by a public no longer unaware of foreign threats to their interests.

The idea takes root quite early in the play, when Drake, trapped in a frustrating conversation with Representative Shuffler, makes a fateful threat:

> It's about time someone should talk out loud to you if you won't listen to reason. We give our minds and hearts and souls to special branches of the public interest and might be supposed to know something about them. Do you heed us? Oh, no. We're prejudiced. It's beneath the dignity of the Legislative to listen to the experts of the Executive. *I'm going out to explain a few things to my fellow citizens*.[169]

---

[168] *ibid*., 164–65.
[169] *ibid*., 45.

As relations between the professionals and Congress sour, the prospect of dealing directly with the people only becomes more appealing. When the defense bills stall in the Senate, Drake reaches his breaking point. "Let's resign the service," he proposes to Hawk. "What's the use? We cannot serve our country with men like those"—referring to Shuffler and the troublesome Senators—"standing like a stone wall between us and the nation." Hawk agrees, and together, the two professionals leave their posts and "enlist in the army for the salvation of the United States of America."[170]

As war looms, the "salvation army" begins to take shape. After mounting a successful bid for a seat in Congress, Hawk resolves to invest his considerable fortune in "a sort of patriotic league." Drake, who has become a successful journalist by writing editorials in favor of military preparedness—"I find he's making some of the people in the Capitol sit up," a delighted General Middleton reports to Hawk—pledges his support. Their plan is vague, but ambitious. "We can see no hope except attacking the national diseases at the root—in telling the truth to people and arousing public opinion," Hawk explains. "With a string of newspapers and some magazines and an organization extending into every State, town and ward and getting some other fools like us to join in, we can get the nation's interests understood and lay the foundation for making this a real nation and a happy family."[171] Hawk's death deprives the movement of its leader, but its spirit grows stronger under the strain of military defeat. Representative Shuffler, Senator

[170] *ibid*., 101, 113.
[171] *ibid*., 137, 139, 163–64.

Rock, and Senator Dormant become converts, and as *Stultitia* concludes, Drake and Miss Middleton—now Mrs. Drake—extend and olive branch to their chastened foes.

MR. DRAKE

> Hawk and I had a compact to organize a National Patriotic League with a branch in every town, village, county and ward to revive the old American spirit and awaken the people to trust in each other and to work together, to be patriotic and to discharge the duties of our representative government.

MRS. DRAKE

> (*To the* SENATORS) And you'll all help us, won't you? (*Pleadingly*) You'll all join this Patriotic League? . . . Won't you join as Americans in keeping [Captain Hawk's] memory green and carrying out [his] work? Go home now and begin doing your duty to your country. Remember we're all one family. Do let us all join to make the family *good* and *happy*—that's the important thing—not to be rich and big and miserable.[172]

Although addressed "to the Senators," these remarks, which end Wilson's play, are clearly meant for the audience as a whole. We, too, are invited to carry out Captain Hawk's work; we, too, must remember that "we're all one family." After all, the message of *Stultitia*—clear, simple, and terrifying in its implications—is the same as that of the National Patriotic League's propaganda: all of us must give patriotic, professional policymakers our absolute loyalty—or be prepared to let our country face the consequences.

[172] *ibid*., 179–80.

PART FOUR. AWAKENINGS

4.1. Epilogue: *Stultitia* as a "Blue-Print" to "Save America"

The story of the *Stultitia* Affair is nearly over. There is, however, one more intriguing question which this paper must address: if Huntington Wilson wrote his play shortly before he resigned from the State Department, in response to events which had occurred between 1909 and 1913, why did he wait for two years—until New Year's Day, 1915—before unveiling it to the public? The former Assistant Secretary left behind no written explanation. However, by studying his post-resignation political activities, it is possible to make an educated guess.

By the autumn of 1911, Wilson, an ardent Republican with well-connected relatives, had begun to flirt with the idea of leaving the State Department in order to begin a career in politics. However, he also recognized that he would need to bring himself to the attention of the public before he could realize his ambitions. Thus, over the course of 1911 and 1912, Wilson attempted to convince Secretary of State Knox and President Taft to put him in the spotlight, either by offering him an embassy or by calling attention to a previous offer, which the Assistant Secretary had turned down. "[P]eople always take the attitude that one's diplomatic career should be crowned with an appointment as Ambassador," he explained to President Taft's private secretary in September 1911. "I think it very probable that after this Administration domestic politics would appeal to me more than further diplomacy"; therefore, "it would be a satisfaction to me to have the President's kind offer o[n] record." Taft refused, and Knox, though

vaguely encouraging, was reluctant to see Wilson vacate his administrative position at the State Department.[173]

All was not lost, though. Sometime before the end of 1912, Wilson and his wife developed what they considered to be "quite a good blue-print" for the future. The "blue-print" unfolded in several different stages; the first, obviously meant to burnish Wilson's reputation, proposed that he should leave the State Department and reinvent himself as a kind of political pundit, specializing in international relations. "I already passed for an authority on he Far East," he explained in his *Memoirs*. "Our idea was that I should make a thorough first-hand study of Latin America, write a book about it, and become an authority also on that important part of the world." At that point, the next phase of the plan would begin: "We would then settle down in some state"—"perhaps Pennsylvania," Knox's base of operations—"and go into politics in the hope that I might in time be elected to Congress, perhaps to the Senate." All of this would pave the way for the third part of the plan: ultimately, Wilson hoped to establish himself as "a logical candidate for Secretary of State."[174]

It was a bold, probably unrealistic goal. But the Assistant Secretary's ambitions did not stop there. As Richard Hume Werking has pointed out, "Wilson intended his political career as more than simply an ordeal necessary to become [S]ecretary of [S]tate. His love for order and organization extended to society at large, and he probably

---

[173] Wilson to Charles D. Hilles, 6 September 1911, *HWP*; *ibid*., "After 3 Years with Knox" [handwritten in margin], memorandum of a conversation with Knox, "1912" [handwritten in margin], Folder 14, Doc. 5, *HWP*; Wilson, *Memoirs*, 244–45. Online version of Wilson to Hilles: https://digitalcommons.ursinus.edu/fmhw_other/215/

[174] *ibid*., *Memoirs*, 244.

imagined that as a powerful person he could help reshape his individualistic country into the more unified, interventionist state he desired."[175] The best evidence in support of this claim comes from a political pamphlet Wilson wrote in May 1915. The pamphlet, entitled "Save America!", laid out a concrete plan for creating precisely the kind of "unified, interventionist state" Werking identified: by officially abandoning its vestigial commitment to African-American civil rights, the old Republican Party would be able to fold itself into a new, more dynamic political alliance with white Southern Democrats; the alliance would then defeat the "minority-elected" Woodrow Wilson Administration at the polls and seize control of the federal government, leaving its members free to enact a series of sweeping social and structural reforms. Huntington Wilson described the resulting political metamorphosis in characteristically melodramatic, almost Biblical terms:

> Here is an opportunity for a great and sincere, a chastened and, if needs be, renamed Republican Party of the whole nation, and one aggressively *plain American*. Let it set free and commandeer the brains, the courage, and the soul of the South to join the Whole Nation to strike a higher note and give a new life and meaning to our politics. Give us a clear and high national purpose and our patriotism becomes religious. . . . Politics in the first sense and political duties and service will become, as they should be, the breath of the citizen's life. . . . [A] torrent of constructive thought and action will sweep away the political charlatan and the politician for money. It will demand honor, honesty, scientific methods, efficiency, high ideals—but devotion to America, not impracticable dreams—and the best ability of the country.[176]

A "torrent" of citizen activism, animated by patriotism and a sense of political duty, will contribute to the construction of a well-organized, pragmatic, and high-minded

[175] Werking, *Master Architects,* 160.
[176] Wilson, "Save America!"

political apparatus: here, at the heart of Wilson's "Save America!" program and the end of his "good blue-print," is the same corporate nationalist project John Drake and Captain Hawk attempt to carry out at the end of *Stultitia*. But this time, the project is real, and the author himself is playing the hero's part.

In fact, between 1913 and 1915, Wilson's life imitated art with remarkable fidelity. Like Drake, he took up journalism after resigning from the State Department, setting off on his planned Latin American trip in February 1914; like Hawk, he hoped to enter Congress upon his return to the United States; and along the way, he sems to have started laying the groundwork for the "plain American" political alliance he would later describe in "Save America!" One of Wilson's journal entries from March 1914 contains a passing reference to recruiting officers for something he called the "National Patriotic League"—the same name Hawk and Drake use in *Stultitia*.[177] Surely this is not a coincidence. Nor was it purely by chance that, when Wilson re-released *Stultitia* under his own name in February 1915, he gave it a new title: *Save America!*[178]

4.2. Conclusion

Unfortunately for Wilson, the "good blue-print" fell apart before America could be "saved." Various family problems cut his Latin American trip short, forcing him to head for home in December 1914 and then sending him to France, where his father was recovering from a stroke, almost immediately thereafter. Somehow, he managed to have

[177] *ibid*., notes on a trip through Latin America, "Ancon, [Panama] Canal Zone, March 9, 1914," Folder 8, Doc. 2, *HWP*.
[178] *ibid*., *Save America! An Appeal to Patriotism* (New York: Frederick A Stokes, 1915).

Stultitia published anonymously in his absence, and in February he returned to the United States. At this point, however, Wilson's marriage began to collapse, derailing all of his plans and plunging him into a long depression which "[took] the zest from [his] ambition."[179] It is not clear whether the "Save America!" pamphlet was published at all, and by the beginning of the summer, the enthusiastic press coverage of *Stultitia* had dried up almost completely.[180]

"I am inclined to believe it an axiom, disgusting as it is, [that it is better] *to be known, favorably if possible, rather than not at all; and above all not to be forgotten*. I speak," wrote an unhappy Wilson in October 1915, "of my own selfish policy."[181] Judged by this standard, his attempt to enter the domestic political arena must be judged a failure. The nation had not rallied to his cause; it had failed to become a corporate community attuned to the needs of professional foreign policymakers; and however favorably it might have responded to Wilson and his play at the beginning of 1915, within a few months it had forgotten both of them.

Yet if *Stultitia* itself wound up languishing in obscurity, the corporate nationalist impulse it distilled and reproduced would cast a long shadow over the American foreign service. As this paper has shown, corporate nationalism decisively shaped the service's institutional culture. The assumptions baked into that culture, which associated masculinity with dutiful public service and effeminacy with weakness or treachery, look

---

[179] Eppinga, "Aristocrat, Nationalist, Diplomat," 304–313; Wilson, *Memoirs*, 311–313.
[180] "Save America!" exists only as a handwritten draft in *HWP*. The Papers do not contain any press clippings related to *Stultitia* dated later than May 1915.
[181] Wilson to J. Reuben Clark, 13 October 1915, Folder 12, Doc. 9, *HWP*.

remarkably similar to the ones that would trigger the State Department's notorious anti-gay purges during the mid-century "Lavender Scare." They also map neatly onto the worldview of the elite, hypermasculine "imperial brotherhood" Robert Dean has shown at work within the upper echelons of the Cold War national security state.[182] Big things, it seems, have small beginnings; in future, historians will likely have to pay much closer attention to the long-term structural role foreign service reform played in sewing the seeds of masculinism within the American "diplomatic mind."[183]

The history of the *Stultitia* Affair is interesting for another reason as well: it suggests that one of the conventional narratives about the advent of professional diplomacy in the United States requires a bit of retooling. In the past, scholars have often portrayed the reformer-diplomats of the early twentieth century as insular, elitist Europhiles keen on running the foreign service like a "pretty good club."[184] Wilson, by contrast, saw foreign policymakers like himself as actors on a much larger political stage, and as a result, he tried to place them at the head of a mass movement. The coalition-building strategies Wilson developed along the way help situate him within the broader landscape of American domestic politics. Like the upper-class urban reformers of the

---

[182] David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004); Robert D. Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood: Gender and the Making of Cold War Foreign Policy* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001).

[183] Schulzinger, *Diplomatic Mind*, describes the relationship between foreign service reform and the political outlook of American diplomats. However, as noted at the beginning of this paper, Schulzinger's focus is primarily interested in describing Progressive meliorism; he mentions gender only in passing. See, for example, *ibid*., 108–110.

[184] The most famous version of this interpretation is to be found in Martin Weil, *A Pretty Good Club: The Founding Fathers of the U. S. Foreign Service* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1978). See also Heinrichs, "Bureaucracy and Professionalism"; and Schulzinger, *Diplomatic Mind*.

early Progressive era, he responded to critics who challenged his masculinity by "constructing more aggressive forms of political manhood," seeking to legitimize professional diplomacy by aligning it more closely with the habits and interests of the nonelite body politic.[185] At the same time, Wilson also searched for a way to align the body politic more closely with the interests of its masters, thereby "mak[ing] democracy safe for elites." It was a project the leaders of the "preparedness" movement, with which the author of *Stultitia* so obviously identified, would have recognized instantly.[186]

However, the real significance of Wilson's play lies in what it reveals about the relationship between professional diplomacy and modernity. According to C. A. Bayly, the birth of the modern world was heralded by "the rise of global *uniformities* . . . , visible not only in great institutions . . . [but] also in . . . 'bodily practices': the ways in which people dressed, spoke, ate, and managed relations within families." These uniformities were the natural byproducts of globalization: "As world events became more interconnected and interdependent, so forms of human action adjusted to each other and came to resemble each other across the world." But greater connectedness and greater cultural legibility had a dangerous side effect. For as Bayly has shown, "connections could also highlight the sense of *difference*, and even antagonism, between people in different societies, and especially among their elites." By the turn of the twentieth

---

[185] Kevin Murphy, *Political Manhood: Red Bloods, Mollycoddles, and the Politics of Progressive Era Reform* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008).
[186] Michael S. Pearlman, *To Make America Safe for Democracy: Patricians and Preparedness in the Progressive Era* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1984).

century, it was clear that the modern world would be one of exchange, mixing, and cosmopolitan hybridity—but it would also be a world of nations.[187]

Diplomats stood (and continue to stand) at the point of maximum tension between the new cosmopolitanism and the new nationalism. On the one hand, they are the key "custodians" of what Hedley Bull famously termed "international society," responsible for defining the rules and norms that govern interactions between sovereign states. Members of the diplomatic corps thus adhere to the same codes of etiquette, share a common diplomatic culture, and may feel a sense of corporate identity that cuts across the formal boundaries separating national services. At the same time, every diplomat is supposed to act as the representative of an imagined national community, safeguarding that community's interests and embody its supposed characteristics.[188]

Practitioners and scholars of diplomacy have long fretted about this tug of war and the divided loyalties it threatens to create. Diplomats, they believe, must "constantly attempt to find the right balance between the interests of their country and their activity within the diplomatic corps . . . . It is a contrast between national identity and corporate identity."[189] But this sort of statement raises more questions than it answers. Diplomats as a group constitute the international diplomatic corps—but who constitutes a nation? It is unwise to assume the existence of homogeneous national communities with agreed-upon

---

[187] C. A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1914* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004), 1.
[188] Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977). See also Paul Sharp and Geoffrey Wiseman, eds., *The Diplomatic Corps as an Institution of International Society* (Houndsmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007).
[189] Sasson Sofer, "The Diplomatic Corps as a Symbol of Diplomatic Culture," in Sharp and Wiseman, *Diplomatic Corps*, 35.

"interests," ready and waiting for member-diplomats to defend if only they manage to "find the right balance." Doing so leaves little room for treating cultural diversity and political dissent, at the domestic level, as anything other than anomalous nuisances—or dangerous threats.

This paper has taken a different tack, identifying the origins of this kind of essentialist thinking within the American foreign service. It has suggested that the reformers responsible for inventing professional diplomacy—men like Huntington Wilson—wished desperately, for reasons both practical and ideological, to identify with and draw strength from disciplined, monolithic national political communities. To his horror, Wilson quickly discovered that no such community existed in the United States. So, on New Year's Day, 1915, he set about trying to make one.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

Manuscript Collections and Databases:

Papers of Dickinson, Charles Monroe. Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Papers of Wilson, Francis Mairs Huntington. Myrin Library, Ursinus College, Collegeville, PA.

Record Group 59 (Department of State), National Archives, College Park, MD

ProQuest Congressional Database

Congressional Record. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office. Published annually.

Dunne, Peter Finley. *Dissertations by Mr. Dooley*. New York: Harper Brothers, 1906.

[Einstein, Lewis.] *American Foreign Policy*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1909.

Grosvenor, Edward. "American Diplomacy." *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1898* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1899), 285–300.

Henry, O. *Cabbages and Kings*, in *The Complete Works of O. Henry* (Garden City, NJ: Garden City Publishing Company, 1937).

Johnson, Arthur C. "To Prod Diplomats." Washington *Post*, 11 February 1910, 1.

Loomis, Francis B. "The Foreign Service of the United States." *North American Review* 169/514 (1899): 349–62.

Wilson, [Francis Mairs] Huntington. "The American Foreign Service." *Outlook* 82/9 (1906): 499–504.

--. "The Consular Service: Assistant Secretary of State Huntington Wilson, '98, Urges Need for Capable Men." *Yale Daily News*, 29 March 1909.

--. *Memoirs of an Ex-Diplomat*. Boston: Bruce Humphries, 1945.

[--.] *Stultitia: A Nightmare and an Awakening in Four Discussions*. New York: Vail-Ballou, 1913. Republished as *Save America! An Appeal to Patriotism*. New York: Frederick A Stokes, 1915.

Twain, Mark. "Diplomatic Pay and Clothes," reprinted in *Forum* XCV/3 (1936) [1899].

SECONDARY SOURCES

Bayly, C. A. *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1914*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004.

Bull, Hedley. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Cohen, Naomi W. "The Abrogation of the Russo-American Treaty of 1832." *Jewish Social Studies* 25/1 (1963): 3–41.

Dean, Robert D. *Imperial Brotherhood: Gender and the Making of Cold War Foreign Policy*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001.

Egan, Clifford L. "Pressure Groups, the Department of State, and the Abrogation of the Russo-American Treaty of 1832," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 115/4 (1971): 328–34.

Eppinga, Richard Jay. "Aristocrat, Nationalist, Diplomat: The Life and Career of Huntington Wilson." PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.

Ilchman, Warren Frederick. *Professional Diplomacy in the United States: A Study in Administrative History, 1779–1939*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Israel, Jerry. "A Diplomatic Machine: Scientific Management in the Department of State, 1906–1924." In Jerry Israel, ed., *Building the Organizational Society: Essays on Associational Activities in Modern America* (New York: Free Press, 1972), 183–96.

--. *Progressivism and the Open Door: America and China, 1905–1921*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1971.

Johnson, David K. *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Kaufmann, Burton I. "The Organizational Dimension of United States Economic Foreign Policy, 1900–1920." *Business History Review* 46/1 (1972): 17–44.

Murphy, Kevin. *Political Manhood: Red Bloods, Mollycoddles, and the Politics of Progressive Era Reform*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Nickles, David Paull. "US Diplomatic Etiquette during the Nineteenth Century." In Markus Mösslang and Torsten Riotte, eds., *The Diplomats' World: A Cultural History of Diplomacy, 1815–1914* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008), 287–316.

Otte, T. G. "Eyre Crowe and British Foreign Policy: A Cognitive Map." In T. G. Otte and Constantine Pagedas, eds., *Personalities, War, and Diplomacy: Essays in International History* (London: Routledge, 1997), 14–37.

Pearlman, Michael S. *To Make America Safe for Democracy: Patricians and Preparedness in the Progressive Era*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1984.

Rosenberg, Emily S. *Financial Missionaries to the World: The Politics and Culture of Dollar Diplomacy, 1900–1930*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

--. *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expasnsion, 1890 –1945*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1982.

Schulzinger, Robert D. *The Making of the Diplomatic Mind: The Training, Outlook, and Style of United States Foreign Service Officers, 1908–1931*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1975.

Sharp, Paul, and Geoffrey Wise, eds. *The Diplomatic Corps as an Institution of International Society* (Houndsmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007).

Weil, Martin. *A Pretty Good Club: The Founding Fathers of the U. S. Foreign Service*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1978.

Werking, Richard Hume. *The Master Architects: Building the United States Foreign Service, 1890–1913*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1977.